

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11839) for the relief of Sarah J. Norcross; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11840) for the relief of J. Ballard Taylor; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11841) granting an increase of pension to George E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11842) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Junkens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11843) granting an increase of pension to Frank Offenstien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11844) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Mahannah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to Elias Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11846) for the relief of Martha H. Hamlin, widow of John H. Hamlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UTTER: A bill (H. R. 11847) granting an increase of pension to John Hamill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11848) granting an increase of pension to William T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension for William T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of residents of northern part of New York City, in favor of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Retail Druggists' Association of Fond du Lac County, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of House bill 8887, providing for a stamp tax on proprietary and patent medicines and certain druggist sundries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, affidavits in support of House bill 11423, granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, affidavits accompanying bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Beare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying bill for increase of pension to Arthur Scrivner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: Statement of C. M. D. Browne, Alonzo O. Bliss, Elizabeth C. Allen, Shelton T. Cameron, Ephraim J. Totten, Nettie B. Browne, Edward J. Taylor, and S. Fay Harper, alleging that certain streets of the city of Washington, D. C., are being obstructed by private persons without authority of law, and protesting against such obstruction; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, letter accompanied by printed statement from John Norris, chairman of committee on paper of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, alleging that if certain information should be obtained that it would show the International Paper Co. to be an illegal combination and has repressed competition by stopping and dismantling paper machines, and alleging that the Root amendment to the reciprocity bill aims to fasten permanently upon the consumers of news-print paper in every State of the Union the tax of at least \$6,000,000 per annum, which that consolidation of 30 antiquated mills in New England and New York State has made possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Petitions of numerous citizens of Weeks and Caulksville, Ark., asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of 13 citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., asking for reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Papers to accompany bill No. 8809; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions adopted by the Milwaukee Clearing House Association, relating to proposed legislation affecting the cold-storage industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of George Hobbs & Sons and other citizens of Alice, Tex., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petitions of numerous citizens of Waco, Tex., and of the Litchfield (Ill.) Merchants' Association,

requesting a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Snohomish, Wash., protesting against Senate bill 237, for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of H. Slippert, A. Hostmark, and Paul Palmer, of Poulsbo, Wash., asking for reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Ashley R. Farless, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Senate joint resolution 3; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Tillman & Bendel, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of F. J. Ackermann, Bay City, Mich., for reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution by Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, favoring the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill without amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 97, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and numerous other petitions, all of Pennsylvania, relating to the question of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of William H. Reeser and others, of Reading, and Wilson Kunkel, of Albany, Pa., in favor of a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the United German-American and United Irish-American Societies of New York, urging the rejection of the proposed new arbitration with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Alexandria and Logansport branches of the Alliance of German Societies of the State of Indiana, favoring House bill 166, providing for an investigation of the administration of the immigration office at Ellis Island, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of western Washington, urging Congress to ratify proposed arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petitions of 1,672 citizens of the twenty-seventh congressional district of New York, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UTTER: Papers to accompany bills granting an increase of pension to John Hamill, Elizabeth F. Taylor, and James M. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., favoring a general arbitration treaty with Great Britain, France, and other countries, as proposed by President Taft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Greystone Republican Club of Rhode Island, favoring political union between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, June 19, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

CLAIMS OF LABORERS IN NAVY YARDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, transmitting information relative to the duplication of certain cases relating to claims of laborers in navy yards transmitted to the Senate in the findings by the court and requesting the return to the court of the findings in which duplications appear, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 50.)

ERSKINE R. K. HAYES V. UNITED STATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court and the opinions of Judges Barney and Howry in the cause of Erskine R. K. Hayes v. United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 51.)

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 10.

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to grant to the State of Colorado 1,000,000 acres of land under the Carey Act of August 18, 1894.

Whereas the State of Colorado did by an act of the general assembly, approved March 15, 1895, accept the original grant of Congress of 1,000,000 acres under the Carey Act of August 18, 1894; and

Whereas the acceptance of said grant has been greatly to the advantage of the State of Colorado; and

Whereas it appears that all of said 1,000,000 acres has been applied for in approved and pending Carey Act applications; and

Whereas there are prospective applications now being prepared that will require several hundred thousand acres; and

Whereas increased irrigated lands means increased prosperity to the State: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Eighteenth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the State of Colorado hereby asks and requests that an additional 1,000,000 acres of land be granted to the State of Colorado under the provisions of said act of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington; and further, that the State board of land commissioners, as at present constituted, be authorized to accept on behalf of the State of Colorado said grant, provided the same is made.

STEPHEN R. FITZGERALD,

President of the Senate.

GEORGE MCLACHLAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, May 29, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,

Governor of the State of Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Bar Association of Bernalillo County, N. Mex., praying that early action be taken on the joint resolution for the admission of New Mexico as a State, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Amory, Miss., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Haywards, Alameda County, and Oakland, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday rest bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, of California, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of O. K. Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burdett, Kans., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of the Men's Club of the Pilgrim Congregational Church, of Brooklyn Hills, N. Y.; of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio; and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of western Washington, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Stove Mounters' Union, No. 4, of Brewery Workers' Union, No. 21, of the Trades and Labor Assembly, and of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 250, all of Belleville, in the State of Illinois; of the Trades and Labor Council of Silverbow, Mont.; and of the Central Labor Union of St. Johnsbury, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oconto, Nebr., remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax on proprietary medicines, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of the New Hampshire Unitarian Association and a petition of the Chicago Peace Society, of Illinois, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN. I present resolutions adopted at the twenty-second annual session of the Congress of the Knights of Labor,

held at Albany, N. Y., January 10-12, 1911, relative to the proposed reciprocity agreement. The resolutions are short, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
Albany, N. Y., June 17, 1911.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the twenty-second annual session of the Congress of the Knights of Labor, held at Albany, N. Y., January 10 to 12, 1911, the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position in favor of a protective tariff, and that the board of directors be, and they hereby are, instructed to prepare and issue an address to the workers of the country calling their attention to the fact that every dollar's worth of competitive imports entering the ports of the United States displaces that amount of products manufactured in American factories, mills, and workshops by American workmen.

Resolved, That we oppose any revision of the tariff, by reciprocity or otherwise, which does not adequately protect American industrial products against the competition of foreign labor, as any downward revision of the tariff means a downward revision of wages.

Article 2 of our constitution reads:

"The particular objects for which said association is formed and for which it was organized are: To make industrial and moral worth, not wealth, the true standard of individual and national greatness; to enact into statute law the preamble of the Knights of Labor; the maintenance of a tariff policy for the protection of American labor and industry; and the retention of the American market for American products."

In accordance with the above resolutions and constitutional provision of our organization, we are opposed to House bill 4412, which is apparently designed to carry out and make effective the so-called reciprocity treaty entered into between the Canadian Government and the United States.

We will not attempt, for it would be impossible, to point out all of the objections which might be urged to its favorable consideration, for time sufficient to accomplish that end is not at our command.

We have read with great care the provisions of the proposed treaty with reference to the admission of wood pulp and paper into the United States, and we must admit that its provisions are by no means clear, and, in fact, we think will be found not to carry into effect the views of the high contracting parties. It is really bad enough as it is, but to have any mistake made about it would be worse. It must be borne in mind that the various Provinces of Canada own what is called "Crown lands," and each Province has the absolute right to determine what shall be done with its own products. The Province of Ontario about 12 years ago prohibited the exportation of any of the products of the forests in rough state to the United States. This policy was followed by the Province of Quebec just recently. The question now arises under the treaty, Just what are we getting? It does not say in expressed terms, as it should, that the benefits of the American markets shall not be open to the Canadian manufacturers of paper until all restrictions of whatsoever kind are removed by the various Provinces. On the contrary, it is quite possible, and it is our construction, that paper manufactured from wood cut on lands owned by individuals would be admissible into the United States whether the restrictions now maintained by the various Provinces are removed or not. If we are correct in this construction, the outrage of such legislation would simply be increased. The bill should at least be amended so as to leave no error in it upon this very important question, for unless the American manufacturer of paper secures a free and unlimited supply from Canada, then there is absolutely no excuse whatsoever for the terms of this treaty, so far as this industry is concerned.

There was an exhaustive inquiry made into this question of the duty on print paper by the Mann committee two years ago, and while we did not agree with the deductions and conclusions of the committee, they reported at that time that there ought to be a duty of \$2 per ton on white print paper. After a very careful investigation the House agreed with the Mann committee on a \$2 tariff—a ton. The bill went to the Senate, and they concluded that \$4 per ton more correctly represented the required tariff, and Congress finally compromised on \$3.75 per ton.

Further, we have been informed upon the best of authority that the President of the United States at that time stated that the paper makers had made a better case than anyone else who had appeared before him for a protective tariff upon their industries. The subject has since that time been referred to the Tariff Board, which during the past year has made an exhaustive inquiry into this subject, and in the final report of this commission the difference in cost of production between the two countries was stated to be \$5.35 per ton.

This is one of the greatest industries—in fact, the second greatest single industry—in the United States of America. Its capital is represented by tens of millions of dollars. The amount paid yearly to the laborers is represented in millions of dollars. Its toilers are numbered by the tens of thousands. What has it done that it should be singled out from all the industries which concededly should be protected for public execution—and in behalf of our Canadian brethren and a few newspaper owners—who, through the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, under the direction of Mr. John Norris and Mr. Herman Ridder, have carried on a relentless war for the past five years to destroy the paper industry of the United States because they were not permitted to dictate the price at which print paper should be sold.

If finished paper is to be imported into this country free of duty, the great paper industry will be crippled, and the man who is a paper maker by trade has got to go to Canada to follow his trade, and take his wife and family into the wilderness to live, where there is no compulsory education law and not one of the comforts of civilization. It means the death blow to many communities clustered about the paper mills and the breaking up of American homes and migration of our skilled labor to Canada, and we are going to have a lot of mills on our hands, that won't sell for money enough to pay the bondholders, and the Canadians are going to have our business and our profits.

Reciprocity has been tried in this country several times, but has failed for good reasons. In particular has this been so, and always will continue to be so, where there exists competition between two countries in the raising or production of the same articles which are

affected by reciprocity. Of necessity it is intended that when articles are placed upon the free list, or tariff greatly reduced, it must place the producer of these articles upon both sides at a disadvantage with reference to such production. Take the present proposed treaty, for example. The farmer's products of all kinds are placed upon the free list, while the Canadian manufacturer is supposed, in consideration thereof and of benefits accruing, to reduce the tariff, which is his protection, upon the articles which he produces. Nothing is placed upon the free list for the benefit of either, yet they are compelled to bear the whole burden for the alleged benefit of others. For instance, what return does the American farmer receive in consideration of the placing of all of his products upon the free list and which, at the same time, places him in competition with the producers of other lands? We submit that he receives nothing in return for this sacrifice on his part. He still continues to work his farm, which has cost him much more than his competitor; pays more for the wages of his farm hands and purchases all of the necessities of life for himself and family in the highest markets of the world. No tariff is reduced on anything which he purchases, but only on that which he produces. He pays just as high prices as before on the necessities of life. Where, then, does he come in? He simply does not come in. He is left to shift for himself as best he can, bearing the additional burdens of state for the benefit of others.

At the same time how fares it with the Canadian manufacturer? Under the provisions of this bill he is also called upon to make sacrifice. He finds that everything that he and his employees purchase has gone up in price, and, at the same time, he is forced into competition with a strong neighbor with reference to all that he produces. Clearly, these two classes of citizens, to wit, the American farmer and the Canadian manufacturer, are being discriminated against for a more favored class. In this case the American farmer is discriminated against in favor of the American manufacturer, and, on the other hand, the Canadian manufacturer is discriminated against in favor of the Canadian farmer. In other words, one class of our citizens is made to suffer a loss for the proposed benefit of another, which policy no party can stand or endure for the reason that it is grossly unfair as well as unequal treatment of our citizens who are being discriminated against. There should and must be equality of opportunity or the principle of protection must perish. We are protectionists. We believe in the principle of universal protection, but it must apply equally to all. It must apply to all parts of our common country, equally to the tillers of the soil and to those engaged in manufacture. Then the principle is safe, otherwise it must perish, for the people will no more endure half protection and half free trade than our forefathers would suffer our Nation to remain half free and half slave. It must be one or the other, and now is the time when that question is to be determined.

The human race is like a man lost in the forests; it moves in circles, but we come back to the starting point in time. So it is with reference to the Canadian reciprocity, for in 1854 a treaty was concluded between the United States and Great Britain acting in behalf of Canada which placed substantially all the products of the farm upon the free list in consideration of certain alleged concessions in favor of our manufacturing industries. This treaty was to continue for a period of 10 years and as much longer as the contracting parties should mutually agree. It is interesting to note the workings of that treaty and the results. It is sufficient to say that the imports into the United States during the time the treaty continued in force, to wit, from 1854 to 1866, increased 261 per cent. We quote the following from a report of the committee of the Canadian Privy Council, dated February 19, 1864, viz:

"It would be impossible to express in figures with any approach to accuracy the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the reciprocity treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this Province, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities."

While it will thus be seen that the treaty was in great favor, on account of the benefits conferred, with Canada, how is it looked upon by the people of the United States? We find that on January 18, 1865, notice was given by this country to Great Britain of its intention to abrogate the treaty on the grounds that it was "no longer for the interests of the United States to continue the same in force."

This tells the whole story, so far as the United States is concerned. The treaty lasted 12 years and came to an ignominious end on March 17, 1866, and no statesman worthy of the name has sought to revive it up to the present day.

The difficulty of such arrangements we have attempted to point out, to wit: It is impossible to deal fairly and without discrimination with our people; but, on the other hand, it favors one interest to the detriment of another, for which no party can be responsible.

In concluding this subject we desire to call the attention of the Finance Committee of the Senate to the remarks of Senator John Sherman, of Ohio, made in the Senate of the United States in 1865, when the subject of annulling the reciprocity treaty with Canada was under consideration:

"The farmer is compelled to pay tax in various forms on every commodity he consumes and on everything that he raises, while, by our treaty with Great Britain, all the products of Canada come into our markets free from duty. While this treaty stands it is a discrimination against every farmer and every mechanic and every industrial interest of the Western States. The farmer in Canada may raise his grain and produce and send it to our markets free of duty, and it pays no tax. We can not reach their railroads; we can not tax their transportation; we can not affect them in the least; and yet every interest of our farmers is taxed. It is manifest, therefore, that while we maintain our present system of internal taxation the reciprocity treaty is a direct benefit to the Canadian producer, farmer, and mechanic, and it is a discrimination against our own farmers and mechanics. It seems to me, therefore, for this reason alone, if there were no other, that this treaty ought to fall."

The same reasoning which applied then applies now with even greater force, and history will be found to be simply repeating itself.

The Canadian reciprocity bill (H. R. 4412) now pending before the Senate is the entering wedge for the destruction of the policy of protection to American labor and American industry, and we wish to be recorded as being against this bill or any similar measure which seeks to destroy the farming and manufacturing industries of the United States by turning the American market over to foreigners.

Respectfully submitted.

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
R. MANSION, Secretary and Treasurer.

[SEAL.]

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the congregations of the Seventh-Day Adventist Churches of La Fayette and El-nora, in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BOURNE presented a memorial of Schools Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oregon, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of William A. Harty Branch, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of New Britain, Conn., and a memorial of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of New London, Conn., and a petition of the dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Connecticut, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Monroe, Conn., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Derby, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado requesting Congress to grant to the State of Colorado 1,000,000 acres of land under the Carey Act, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a petition of the First Unitarian Society of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Rock County Association of Retail Druggists of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax on proprietary medicines, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hart Lot, Mottville, and Skaneateles, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 121 citizens of Elmira and 9 citizens of Horseheads, in the State of New York, praying for the establishment of a national department of health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 78) thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1784) authorizing the acceptance of the dedication of certain land for a street, and for other purposes, to submit an adverse report (No. 79) thereon, and I ask that it be indefinitely postponed, a similar bill having already passed the Senate.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 943) to improve navigation on Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 80) thereon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2653) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 2790) granting an increase of pension to George R. Howard (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 2791) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 2792) to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2793) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2794) to class mates in the Navy as warrant officers; and

A bill (S. 2795) to promote pharmacists to the grade of chief pharmacists in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2796) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2797) to provide for payment of interest on judgments rendered against the United States for money due on public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2798) granting a pension to Livona C. Becker;

A bill (S. 2799) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Barnes; and

A bill (S. 2800) granting an increase of pension to Royal Cranston (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 2801) granting an increase of pension to Maryetta Thurber;

A bill (S. 2802) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Nicholas;

A bill (S. 2803) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Harris;

A bill (S. 2804) granting an increase of pension to Rufus S. Dixon;

A bill (S. 2805) granting an increase of pension to William J. Knowles;

A bill (S. 2806) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Spencer;

A bill (S. 2807) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Baub;

A bill (S. 2808) granting an increase of pension to Sullivan H. Dawley;

A bill (S. 2809) granting an increase of pension to William A. Munroe;

A bill (S. 2810) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Whitworth;

A bill (S. 2811) granting an increase of pension to Sarah B. Arnold Potter;

A bill (S. 2812) granting an increase of pension to Helen Hill Sanford;

A bill (S. 2813) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Bonn;

A bill (S. 2814) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Higgins;

A bill (S. 2815) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Babcock;

A bill (S. 2816) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Carlin; and

A bill (S. 2817) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 2818) providing for competitive designs for a naval monument in the Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 2819) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2820) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta S. Kimball; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2821) for the relief of James D. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND (by request):

A bill (S. 2822) creating a national road commission and prescribing its powers and duties; also creating a system of national roads, establishing a national road fund, and providing the manner of expending the same in cooperation with the several States for the furtherance of good roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I submit an amendment, which I shall present later, to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

SOLDIER'S ROLL OF THE SENATE.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate are hereby directed to retain in the employ of the Senate those persons who served in the Union Army during the late Civil War and whose service in the Senate is satisfactory, and to continue such persons in their positions until cause for their removal shall have been reported to and approved of by the Senate and their removal directed.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the committee to investigate whether in the election of WILLIAM LORIMER as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices under Senate resolution 60, Sixty-second Congress, first session, be, and it is hereby, authorized to have printed for the use of the committee testimony, documents, and records taken and received by it in evidence.

ABOLITION OF SENATE OFFICES.

Mr. LODGE. I submit the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the offices designated as "superintendent of the folding room," "assistant postmaster and mail carrier," "clerk, compiling a history of revenue and general appropriation bills," one unemployed messenger, and one unemployed laborer, be, and are hereby, abolished.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BURTON. I should like to hear the enumeration of those positions again.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution proposes to abolish the office of superintendent of the folding room, no work being done by anyone under that title; the office of assistant postmaster, as no work is being done by anyone under that title; the office of clerk to compile a history of tariff and appropriation legislation, as all the appropriations are attended to by the clerks of the Appropriations Committee and the tariff work is intermittent, to be provided for by special provisions; a messengership, the holder of which is never present at the Capitol, and a laborer's position, the holder of which is never present at the Capitol.

Mr. BURTON. I do not object to the general tenor of the resolution, but I understood such changes were to take effect August 1 next, and I understand that this is to take effect immediately.

Mr. LODGE. That was in regard to details.

Mr. CURTIS. The changes which are to take effect August 1 are those known as details. I was secretary of the caucus, and that is my recollection; also the minutes show that to be the case.

Mr. LODGE. It was only in regard to details.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that one or two of these are details; one, at any rate.

Mr. LODGE. Only one may be detailed. The others certainly are not.

Mr. SMOOT. One is a detailed officer.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the resolution may go over.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KERN. I desire to inquire whether the committee is satisfied that there are no other men on the pay roll of the Senate who are not rendering any service to the Government?

Mr. LODGE. So far as I am aware there are no others on the rolls who are not doing some work.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I desire to inquire how long the condition has obtained which is described by the Senator—that is, men drawing pay and doing no work.

Mr. LODGE. I can not state how long it has obtained. I have only known of it within six weeks.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask one further question. Who is responsible for carrying on the pay roll the names of these men who are doing no work? Who has been responsible for it?

Mr. LODGE. They have been carried on the different rolls of the Senate, and I suppose it is simply because the Senate has not seen fit hitherto to examine it. I will explain it more in detail, if the Senator desires.

Mr. REED. I should like to know the names.

Mr. LODGE. The superintendent of the folding room has no existence in that capacity, but there is a man who holds that office and who is doing other work. He ought to be recorded and carried on the books for the work he does. The office offers no work. All the work of the folding room is under the superintendency of the Sergeant at Arms, and the foreman and assistant foreman are in charge of it.

The assistant postmaster has done work here and is doing work now as a messenger. But he has not been an assistant postmaster for many years. I do not know that he ever was. The clerk to compile appropriations has done work for the Finance Committee at different times on the tariff, and very excellent work, but that is work which will be provided for properly by special provision for that purpose. The messenger referred to has not been here for more than 18 months, and the laborer for not more than 2 years, on account of ill health.

Mr. REED. Have the men who have filled these positions been drawing salaries ever since?

Mr. LODGE. They have.

Mr. REED. What step is it proposed to take to recover the moneys that have been wrongfully paid or fraudulently received?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, they have not received any salaries fraudulently. They have been doing other work than that to which they were accredited with doing in three cases. In the other two cases they have been away on account of illness, I am informed, but the period has been so long that it seems impossible to those of us who investigated it to continue them on the roll further.

Mr. REED. As a matter of fact, the Government has been losing money on these positions other than those filled by the sick men. The Government has been paying out its money and not getting any return.

Mr. LODGE. On two of them it has been paying out money and getting no return.

Mr. REED. What are the names of those gentlemen?

Mr. LODGE. The messenger is named Gaskin, who was attached formerly to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the other is a laborer named James Jones.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair understand the Senator from Ohio to ask that the resolution should go over?

Mr. BURTON. I do not anticipate that I shall oppose it, but I interpose a formal objection and ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over on the request of the Senator from Ohio.

SENATE POST-OFFICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LODGE. I submit the following resolution, which will require action from the Committee to Audit and Control, and I ask that it be referred to that committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the clerk in the post office be hereafter designated as "chief clerk of the post office," and receive an annual salary of \$1,800, and that the person now holding the office of assistant postmaster be appointed messenger at the card door and receive an annual salary of \$1,600.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H. HAYWOOD, JR.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document an address issued to the people of North Carolina by Hon. William H. Haywood, jr., when he resigned his seat in the Senate in 1846, and also as a part of the same document, indicating that it is a separate one, the letter of Senator

Haywood to the legislature of his State, accepting his election as a Senator from the State of North Carolina. (S. Doc. No. 52.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is it the Senator wishes to have printed?

Mr. BAILEY. Senator Haywood's letter of acceptance and his answer to some rather bitter accusations against him. His resignation, of course, as the Senator from Mississippi well knows, grew out of Senator Haywood's unwillingness to support the tariff of 1846, and the administration organ—they had one in that day, they have several in this day—assailed him with vehement bitterness, and this letter is in reply to that attack. It happens, Mr. President, that it is to be found in no public or official document. I had the letter, which relates to one of the most interesting episodes in our political history, copied from the old Niles Register, and I brought it here, as copied for me by a very careful and capable gentleman, to have it printed and thus made a part of the records of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall make no objection, but it strikes me that printing as public documents things that have no present public interest, except the revival of one side of some historical strife, is setting a precedent that might lead to an infinite deal of printing.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, Mr. President, if any gentleman could resurrect a document as valuable as this, I think money would be well spent in printing it. It is, as I said a moment ago, of peculiar historical and political interest.

I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, however, that it does not revive any argument within our own party. It does what I find no satisfaction in doing—it shows that a great Senator was mistaken in the character and effect of a conspicuous Democratic service to the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator think he ought to bring it up against that Senator now?

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I think his fame and memory can bear the burden of that one mistake. He was one of the greatest Senators who ever held a commission from that Commonwealth.

This letter is valuable in another respect. It shows that they abused and vilified Senators in 1846 just as they did in 1896 and as they do in 1911. I rather feel inclined to show that the muckrakers of this day are not without their ancestors of another day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the order to print will be entered.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4412.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the pending amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCUMBER. What is the pending amendment, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance. On page 24, line 3, after the word "board," it is proposed to insert:

and when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that such wood pulp, paper and board, being the products of the United States, are admitted into Canada free of duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that amendment was passed over at my request on Friday last because the Senator from New York [Mr. Root], whose amendment it is, was not then prepared to go on with its discussion. He is not present this morning, and I hope the amendment will be again passed over.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I imagine that the Senator from New York does not need to prepare an address to vindicate an amendment which the President himself says conforms the bill to that agreement. Do I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to indicate that there is any serious opposition to making the law exactly what the treaty is?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I said the Senator from New York was not prepared to go on with the amendment on Friday when the bill was up. He is not here this morning. I then understood he would be ready to go on when the bill was again laid before the Senate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Crane	Jones	Pomerene
Bailey	Crawford	Kenyon	Reed
Borah	Curtis	Kern	Shively
Bourne	Dillingham	Lippitt	Simmons
Bradley	Dixon	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Foster	McCumber	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Swanson
Bryan	Gamble	Martine, N. J.	Thornton
Burnham	Gronna	Myers	Townsend
Burton	Guggenheim	Nixon	Warren
Chamberlain	Heyburn	Page	Wetmore
Chilton	Hitchcock	Penrose	Williams
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	Works

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the pending amendment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I notice the absence of a number of Senators who in the former debate on this subject took a very active part, who, I think, might be said to be somewhat in charge of this particular item of paper and pulp and wood. It seems to me that the matter ought not to be acted on at this time. Personally, I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment with reference to its effect upon the bill. When the time comes, I propose to offer an amendment which will have some little bearing upon this subject—that is, to strike out from the bill the condition that it go into effect as to paper and wood pulp and pulp wood only upon condition that Canada remove all charges of any kind on those articles.

When the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was before the Senate I opposed, and shall again oppose, the double taxation of our people. If, as a matter of fact, viewed from the standpoint of the burden of a tariff on the one hand and the necessity of protection on the other, on the fair equation of those two propositions the duty should be taken off paper, as a matter of justice to the consumer of paper, I for one can not tolerate the idea that that duty shall remain simply because Canada has put another tax upon it. That is biting off our nose to spite our face; and when that point is reached I propose to offer an amendment.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN], who had this matter in charge two years ago, and who is, I think, very much interested in this item, is absent; and it does not seem to me that at this point in the debate, when everybody knows that the debate has got to continue at least for some days yet, we should take a vote upon this question this morning. I move that the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No motion is pending. Does the Senator from Minnesota ask unanimous consent that the amendment be passed over?

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that it be laid aside.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. CLAPP. I object to unanimous consent for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not require unanimous consent. It is the regular order.

Mr. CLAPP. I understood the Chair to say that the request was for unanimous consent for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no. The regular order is the consideration of the amendment, and objection is made to its being temporarily passed over. The question, therefore, is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CLAPP. I move, notwithstanding the objection, that the amendment be temporarily passed over. I think that motion is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that can not be done. The amendment can be discussed; it can be voted down; but the Chair thinks that it can not be moved to lay aside an amendment which is regularly in order.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the Chair mean, notwithstanding a matter is regularly in order, that a motion to lay it aside is not in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not a pending amendment. The whole matter can be laid aside.

Mr. CLAPP. I can not believe that the Chair really means that a motion to lay an amendment aside would be out of order. If the Chair so rules, of course that ends the matter.

Mr. McCUMBER and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota first rose. The Chair will recognize that Senator and then recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no desire, of course, to be even seemingly discourteous to any Senator, nor have I any desire to push things with undue haste; but it seems to me that, although the Senate is a highly deliberative body, when it is not ready to talk and deliberate business might be attended to. I am perfectly willing to take advantage of this opportunity—and I especially call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the matter—to suggest that perhaps we might agree now upon a time at which the vote could be taken upon this amendment and upon the bill.

Mr. CLAPP. That can be disposed of now, as I, for one, will object. I did not ask that the amendment go over to-day on my account, but on account of Senators who are absent and who, I know, are interested and I believe want to be here. It is not fair to them.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. For a question. Does the Senator from Mississippi think it would be quite the thing to push this matter now, with the author of the amendment absent from the Chamber temporarily?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not disposed to push it provided a willingness is shown to agree now to some date—I do not care when—not too remote, when the Senate can vote upon the bill and the amendment.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, the Senator from New York is not here, but I have no doubt he will be here in a moment.

Mr. LODGE. I have just learned that the Senator from New York is in the Capitol, and I have no doubt will be here in a moment.

Mr. WARREN. He is not present here now to speak for his amendment, which is before the Senate, and to lay it aside for the moment until he can return would be according to the practice of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the whole country is waiting out of doors for the result of this vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. Two countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Many of those who are opposed to Canadian reciprocity have said that the business of the country was actually being disturbed because of the agitation of this question, and it seems to me that we ought to be able to agree upon a date at which a vote can be taken upon the bill and the amendments. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is in control of the bill—I have no wish to put my ear in, but I have gotten into it accidentally by the suggestion I made—that probably such a consent could now be obtained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has given notice that he would object to any such agreement being made to-day, as the Chair understood.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would ask the Senator from Minnesota this question, then: If I withdraw the objection which I have made, then will the Senator from Minnesota consider the question of consenting to a day for a vote?

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator from Minnesota personally has no interest in the postponement of this amendment. It was in behalf of Senators who are absent that he urged postponement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is my first term in the Senate of the United States, and in view of the fact that I am not in charge of the bill and therefore might possibly by my insistence put myself in a false attitude, I shall not insist upon the objection. But I do suggest that it is time that some effort was being made to arrive at an agreement as to a date for a vote upon the bill and amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws his objection to the request that the amendment be temporarily passed over.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not wish, so far as I am concerned, that this amendment shall interfere in any way with progress upon this bill or the disposition of the bill. It was my purpose this morning to give notice that on Wednesday of this week, day after to-morrow, at the close of the routine business, with the permission of the Senate, I should make some remarks upon the reciprocity agreement and incidentally upon the committee amendment to which my name has been popularly attached. Unless that is at odds with the purpose of the Senate, I now give that notice.

In the meantime, Mr. President, as I understand, there is no other amendment pending?

Mr. SMOOT. This is the committee amendment.

Mr. ROOT. This is the committee amendment. I see no reason why the bill should not be reported to the Senate. I can say whatever I have to say upon it just as well in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole; and, so far as I am concerned, although I have no right to say anything about the progress of the bill, for it is in the hands of the committee, I shall have no objection whatever to the bill being reported to the Senate, letting the discussion upon that or any other amendment come up in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment, please. The Chair understands that the Senator from Minnesota has asked unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily passed over. To that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] objected. He has now withdrawn the objection. Is there any other objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is temporarily passed over.

Mr. ROOT. Then I give the notice of which I spoke, that at the close of the routine business on Wednesday, with the permission of the Senate, I will make some remarks on the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from New York permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment which he proposes is in harmony with the original agreement between the Canadian commissioners and the United States?

Mr. ROOT. It was not my purpose to go into a discussion of the merits of the amendment to-day, but I am quite ready to answer the Senator's question. This amendment, which is proposed by the committee and which is attributed to me because I suggested it, I believe, to the committee, simply makes the bill conform to the reciprocity agreement and has no other purpose or effect.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator from New York know whether the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament contains the provision recommended by the committee and urged by the Senator from New York?

Mr. ROOT. I do not.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand that the bill in the Canadian Parliament requires that the provision shall not take effect until the various Provinces have agreed not to place an export duty upon the articles contained in it.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the bill in the Canadian Parliament repeats exactly the proviso in the agreement submitted by the President. The Root amendment, in effect, reproduces that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, so far as we are advised, the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament giving effect to this arrangement is in exact harmony with the original understanding, and neither with respect to pulp wood nor print paper has it been changed in any particular from that understanding. The changes have been made by the House of Representatives and enlarge the rights of Canada beyond the treaty agreement to the detriment of the American people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there other amendments to be offered to the bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to make a suggestion in connection with that matter. There seems to be an impression that the Canadian Parliament is subject to the will of the Provinces in regard to foreign commerce. There is no foundation for such a conclusion. The constitution granted to the Provinces expressly excludes that subject. It is all a sham and a pretense that we hear about the necessity for the Government of Canada to have the consent of her Provinces in making any such treaty.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, the Provinces have complete control over Crown lands.

Mr. HEYBURN. This is a question of a tariff regulation governing commerce—

Mr. LODGE. But nine-tenths of the wood and wood pulp comes from wood cut on Crown lands—

Mr. HEYBURN. That is another question.

Mr. LODGE. Which those Provinces control.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is another question.

My remarks grew out of the suggestion of the Senator with reference to the right of Canada to make this tariff arrangement. I say it is absolute, and it is not subject to the consent of or to be withheld by any Province in Canada. The ownership of the lands is another question.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas said nothing about the action, power, or the rights of the Canadian Government. He simply repeated what he understood was one of the provisions of the bill which is pending in the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. HEYBURN. If such a provision is pending, it is voluntary and may perhaps be introduced as an excuse on the part of Canada that she is not absolutely free to make any arrangement with a foreign country with reference to commerce, which, of course, includes the making of tariff regulations.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask leave to have printed in the Record a copy of the provision I have referred to. I have not a copy of the bill on my desk, but I want it printed so that the Record may show just what the provision is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter is as follows:

Provided, That such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of the United States, shall only be admitted free of duty into Canada from the United States when such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of Canada, are admitted from all parts of Canada free of duty into the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I can shorten this matter by reading into the Record the provision of the Canadian bill with which the chairman of the Committee on Finance has provided us. After providing that pulp of wood, mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached or unbleached, and so forth, shall be admitted into the United States free of duty, this proviso is added:

Provided, That such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of the United States, shall only be admitted free of duty into Canada from the United States when such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of Canada, are admitted from all parts of Canada free of duty into the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the provision.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. So it appears to be an absolute agreement on the part of the Canadian Government to admit our paper, our wood pulp, and our pulp wood free into Canada, provided we admit it free into the United States.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Finance Committee, or of some individual member of the Finance Committee, whether or not the so-called Root amendment was unanimously reported by the committee for adoption, and whether or not there was any report from the committee as to the wisdom or the folly of adopting the Root amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the so-called Root amendment was not unanimously adopted by the Finance Committee. I do not recollect the vote, and I do not suppose it is material on the question. So far as the fact that it was put into the bill by a majority vote constitutes a recommendation, the amendment has that recommendation.

Mr. DIXON. There was no reason stated to the Senate in reporting the bill why the Root amendment should be adopted.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from New York was before the committee and made a very able address to the committee, which persuaded a majority to vote to put it in the bill.

Mr. DIXON. What I want to know is whether or not there is any information filed with the Senate from the Finance Committee why the Root amendment should be engrafted onto the original bill.

Mr. PENROSE. There is, in the hearings had before the committee, containing the address of the Senator from New York.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is fully stated there.

Mr. PENROSE. It is fully stated there.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I suggest to the Senator from Montana that the strongest possible argument that could be adduced is in print, and he will find it in the agreement between the United States and Canada.

Mr. DIXON. But the Finance Committee has made no statement whatever to the Senate on the Root amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Those of us who favor that amendment hardly think it necessary to make more than a mere suggestion that for some inscrutable reason the other House dropped from the bill that provision in the agreement. The Canadian Parliament has retained it in its bill.

Mr. PENROSE. On page 574 of the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the Senate the Senator from Montana will find the address of the Senator from New York fully setting forth all the facts in this case.

Mr. DIXON. As I understand, the Finance Committee was not unanimous in the case of the Root amendment.

Mr. PENROSE. I have already stated it was not, and it was so published in the newspapers at the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the Senator from Montana inquired whether there is anything coming from the committee which sets forth the reasons for the action which the different members of the committee took concerning the Root amendment, or has he asked whether there was any report from the committee as a whole?

Mr. DIXON. Any report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no report from the committee as a whole. But some of us in a very modest way undertook to tell why the bill ought to pass and why we thought the Root amendment should not be adopted and why its adoption would result in the indefinite, if not the perpetual, exclusion of print paper and wood pulp and pulp wood from Canada into the American market. In making that report we took the liberty of quoting the strongest possible statement and argument on that side of the case, to wit, part of a speech of the President of the United States, who has very much at heart the success of this negotiation, made at Chicago on a very recent date; and the Senator will find that published for perusal.

Mr. DIXON. As I understand, the President of the United States has made a report of his own against the Root amendment.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon] is curious to know why the majority of the Finance Committee did not accompany the bill with a report. While I sympathize with the Senator's curiosity, I must be permitted to remind him that this course is not without precedent. In fact it seems to be growing unfashionable to file majority reports. The more important the measure the less likelihood apparently of a presentation of an explanatory majority report. Minority views are frequently submitted, but for some reason, as the bill rises in importance the majority seem to prefer to report it without assigning reasons for its passage. In illustration of this, I recall to the Senator's attention the fact that the tariff bill of 1909 was brought into the Senate by the Finance Committee unaccompanied by any report whatever. That bill contained between four and five thousand items of taxation, and was in all respects a measure of capital importance to the country. Yet not a word of committee explanation attended its presentation to the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it is hardly a sufficient answer on the part of the chairman of the committee to the query of the Senator from Montana to say that certain pages of the record fully set forth the reasons that were urged for the adoption of what is known as the Root amendment; and it is but fair to the Senator from Montana to say that the only reasons which were urged in its favor were these: First, that the present bill as it passed the House did not conform either to the agreement that was entered into between this country and Canada or to the bill as introduced in the Canadian Parliament; second, possibly which was more important, that under the bill as it now stands we will receive Canadian paper free into the States of New York and Maine. But the paper manufactured in Maine and New York may not go into Canada free. That is the present condition of the bill.

Mr. DIXON. But—

Mr. McCUMBER. Now just one moment. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] gave reasons or suggested that there were other reasons which those who voted against this amendment would have in reference to the righteousness of their vote.

But, Mr. President, I was among those who voted in the committee against the adoption of the Root amendment. I did not consider that it was very important because there are but two great States in this Union which are specially interested in the manufacture of print paper. Those States are New York and Maine; and I am speaking of those two specially. I understand that the representatives from the State of New York will vote for this agreement whether the Root amendment goes into it or not. They would prefer to have the amendment in, but if it does not go in, they will vote for the bill; and I further understand that the representative from Maine in the Senate of the United States who represents the latest expression of sentiment from the State of Maine will also vote for this agreement whether the Root amendment is adopted or not.

Now, my view of it was that inasmuch as these two States would be perfectly satisfied with this agreement and would vote for this agreement without the Root amendment—an agreement that would say that the product of Canada should come into New York free, but that the product of New York should not go into Canada free—I was perfectly willing that they should vote for it in that particular condition; and, in fact, I preferred that if they desired to vote for it that it should be passed in a way and in such a form that the products of New York and Maine could not go into Canada free and the products of Canada could go

into Maine and New York free, because in voting for this bill they are voting for exactly the same kind of conditions in my State. The products of North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota can not go into Canada free because of the conditions, whereas the articles produced in Canada adjoining those States can come into this country free.

I am willing to let the bill go through with the same idea of reciprocity as it affects Maine and New York that it does when it affects North Dakota, South Dakota, and—

Mr. BAILEY. That is the reason you voted against the Root amendment.

Mr. DIXON and Mr. BAILEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIXON. In view of the very lucid statement of the Senator from North Dakota—and I am certainly obliged to him personally that some one has explained this measure—that this so-called treaty is not reciprocity so far as Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana are concerned, and is not for our agricultural products—

Mr. McCUMBER. Then I do not want it to be reciprocity for the other States.

Mr. DIXON. And is not reciprocity for Maine and New York, so far as the paper men are concerned, how comes this bill to be called a reciprocity bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Let New York and Maine take care of themselves.

Mr. DIXON. I should like to have that information.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I should like to translate into the ideas that are created in my mind by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota his reason for voting against this amendment. It appears to be that he wants this bill to be as bad as possible.

Mr. McCUMBER. It can not be much worse.

Mr. ROOT. He knows that the bill without the amendment departs from the reciprocity agreement. He knows that the amendment makes the bill conform to the reciprocity agreement, and because the amendment will make the bill square with the reciprocity agreement he is against the amendment.

Mr. President, it stands with perfect clearness that the second section of the bill, the section which alone relates to pulp and paper, is not a reciprocity bill. It is—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Excuse me one moment, Senator. It is not the provision of the reciprocity agreement. It may be a better provision than is contained in the agreement. The Senator from Mississippi thinks it is a better provision, but it is not the same provision; it is a different provision. Instead of being a provision for reciprocity, it appears to be a simple provision to remove our duties upon these articles because we wish to remove them, with no reciprocal compensation whatever.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask the Senator from New York if it is not true that the President opposed this amendment, and it was so announced in the press within the last few days?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has the same access to the columns of the press that I have. I prefer not to discuss upon the floor of this Chamber the question as to what the President of the United States has said or done in regard to a measure pending here, except as he has expressed himself in his messages to Congress. I do not think it is a good practice. I do not think it comports with that independence and dignity of consideration and action which we owe to the office of the Senate to base our considerations upon what this or that or the other person or newspaper may have reported as to what the President has said.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas asked the question of the Senator from New York because he understood the Senator from New York to be criticizing those Senators who oppose his amendment, saying that they wanted it defeated because they might make a bad measure of the bill, and I desired to call attention to the fact that the President, who recommended the passage of the measure, was against his amendment. I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from New York, because I am opposed to the agreement.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question.

Mr. ROOT. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to make an observation regarding what the Senator from Kansas has said? I have criticized no Senators, Mr. President, for op-

posing this amendment. I merely stated, and stated, I think, accurately, the position of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator just allow me to analyze his position for one minute?

Mr. ROOT. Allow me to finish my sentence. I do not think that other Senators oppose this amendment because they think the bill will be a better one without it. I impute no motives to any Senator and criticize no Senator.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield, and to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I want a moment with the Senator from New York before he turns his attention to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ROOT. I yield first to the Senator from Texas and then to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from New York certainly does not insist that it is essential to true reciprocity that the agreement between the contracting nations shall relate to the same articles. As I read the history of the Republican Party, their reciprocity always related to different articles. In other words, reciprocity, as invented and as patented by them, was that this Nation, in exchange for a market for some article which we produce, would invite the contracting nation to our markets with some article which we do not produce. Surely it is not essential to true reciprocity, according to the Republican idea, that it shall relate to the same article.

I think the Senator from New York is right about the Senator from North Dakota. I think the Senator from North Dakota believes that this agreement is so bad if he can make it still a little worse he might defeat it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. But I may be mistaken.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Texas is entirely mistaken as to my position. I have not the slightest hope on earth to defeat the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I will revise what I said.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will give my reasons in a moment.

Mr. BAILEY. I will revise what I said and say despairing of its defeat, you want to make it as bad as you can so as to make it odious as soon as you can. My own philosophy is that our real duty is to make a bad thing a little better instead of much worse.

I voted for this amendment, although I want to be frank with the Senate. If they will propose some amendment that will defeat the bill, that amendment will command my earnest support, because, if I could defeat this agreement I would feel that I had done my country a service. But knowing that I can not defeat it, I was rather inclined myself to make it as little objectionable as I could, and in the committee, if I may be permitted to reveal the secrets of the committee room, I voted for the amendment.

If the Senator will excuse me, I want to say one word more in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from New York that we ought not to discuss what the President of the United States has said. My answer is that if it is not proper for us here to discuss what he has said, it was not proper for him to say that anywhere. It will be a long time before I will consent that the President of the United States may traverse this country and discuss matters pending in either House of Congress and still be exempt from such answer as we can make to what he has said.

If the President employs his constitutional means of communication with the two Houses, then the two Houses will confine themselves to his communications, made under and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States; but when the President of the United States speaks, as he did at Chicago, and declared that the purpose of that speech was to induce the public to put pressure on the Senate, he invites a discussion of what he said; and, for my part, I intend to address myself at some length to that remarkable speech of his—remarkable in many respects, but most remarkable of all in that particular paragraph, where, attempting to answer the charge of inconsistency, he involved himself in the most obvious inconsistency that can be found in a presidential document from the beginning of the Government to this day.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will be glad if both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Texas will let me restate my position. It is that the reciprocal idea, if there is any such, in this bill shall apply with the same force and effect in the State of New York as it does in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield in just one moment. Then if the provisions are not reciprocal and just the sooner will they be made reciprocal and just.

I merely want to analyze for one moment the position of the Senator from New York. He says I want to have this bill as bad as possible. If his amendment is not adopted, I understand that he will vote for the bill. Then, Mr. President, the Senator from New York purposes to vote for this bill when it is just as bad as it is possible for it to be. That certainly is a position that I do not want to take. If the nonsupport of his amendment will make the bill as bad as it is possible for the bill to be, then it seems to me that the Senator from New York should join us and vote against it and get a bill that may have more of the elements of true reciprocity, as we understand it from a Republican standpoint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Brown], who has risen?

Mr. ROOT. In a moment. I do not want to get too far away from the point I am discussing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I thought I yielded to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. On the contrary, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Bailey] had spoken.

Mr. ROOT. It is immaterial. What I mean to say is that the Senator from North Dakota is right in supposing that I shall vote for this bill whether this amendment goes on or not. I shall vote for it because I think the bill has a value to the whole country sufficient to overbear and counterbalance any injury or injustice that may be involved in the omission of the reciprocal quality in the provision regarding pulp paper. But I would like to see the bill I mean to vote for made as good as possible. I am going to vote for it because it is a measure of reciprocity, and I should like to see it made in every part a true measure of reciprocity.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. I am going to vote for it because I want the agreement with Canada put into force. I should like to see this bill put that agreement into force as it was made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ROOT. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to have the Senator from New York explain what reciprocity there is in the bill for the farmers. Does he expect that the farmers will get any market to any appreciable extent for their agricultural products in Canada?

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. The Senator asks me a question. I answer, I do. I think there will be a very substantial measure of reciprocity. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that exactly what I have been driving at for two or three days here is to get the Finance Committee to explain to the Senate where the reciprocity comes into this bill.

Mr. NELSON. For the farmer?

Mr. DIXON. For the farmer. Why it is that they label a measure reciprocity which forces every farmer in this country to sell all of his products in a free-trade market and purchase all of his things that he buys in a highly protected market. How a bill of that kind coming from a Republican Finance Committee can carry the label of reciprocity upon it puzzles my brain. I have tried my best to get some information from them.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. NELSON. I see the Senator from Massachusetts has risen.

Mr. DIXON. I will be happy to hear from him.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rose in order to call attention to something said by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Bailey], who, I am sorry to see, has left his seat. He referred to reciprocity agreements hitherto made, and said that in those agreements it was not a case of reciprocity in the same article, but admission free or at low duty; that one article was balanced, perhaps, by the admission free or at low duty of a different article. That is very true, but those agreements were all, so far as I remember, treaties, and in a treaty, as in the case of Cuba and Hawaii, against the admission of sugar at reduced duty or free they took our manufactured articles at a reduced duty or free, and one was held to balance the other, and, I think, correctly held.

I call attention to this point, Mr. President, because it involves what we must sooner or later consider here very carefully—the question of the favored-nation clause in this bill. This is the distinction I desire to make at this time. In the bill, which is not a treaty, where paper is set off against some other totally different article, each article is set off against the same article. The bill proceeds item by item, wheat against wheat, barley against barley, agricultural implements, and so on all down the list; each one is reciprocal. We take the Canadian free or at a certain duty and they take ours, and they are put in the same list. Therefore, when you get to paper, under the head "wood pulp and paper," which is the head in the bill, there and there alone you find an article for which there is no set-off, because the other articles are all provided for one by one as you go down through the list.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question right at that point?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understood the Senator to say a few moments ago, when he was on the floor before, that a very large portion of the wood pulp and pulp wood imported into this country from Canada came from the Crown lands.

Mr. LODGE. I did.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the correspondence, as I recall the fact, Mr. Fielding and his associate protected themselves by declaring that Canada would not undertake through this legislation, which the Senator from Nebraska has read a moment ago, to deliver—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me finish my sentence. They would not agree to make good this pledge so far as it affects pulp wood and wood pulp on the Crown lands of the Provinces.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has raised that point. Under the negotiations, as stated in the letter of the Canadian commissioners, and in the agreement which was submitted to Congress, the balancing between wood pulp and paper on the one side and wood pulp and paper on the other was the same, because certain conditions are recognized. They did not say simply wood pulp and paper as they say barley without any other conditions at all, but they said under certain conditions wood pulp and paper shall come in free from Canada, and under certain conditions wood pulp and paper shall go free from the United States into Canada. So there were two balanced items. If the Provinces refused to comply with the wishes of the Dominion Government, both those items drop out; but they are reciprocal all through.

The point I was trying to make was that under this arrangement the item of wood pulp and paper as it stands in the bill passed by the House is an item which has no balancing return; there is no equivalent; and it comes, it seems to me, under the definition which John Quincy Adams made in 1817 of a gratuitous concession. I am not prepared absolutely to say that that is the case, but I am very strongly of that opinion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I will come back to that in a moment. I want to finish this point.

The American doctrine has always been that reciprocal agreements do not invade the favored-nation clause. I think the American doctrine has been perfectly sound, and the European doctrine has been full of contradictions in their efforts to get around their theory. Our doctrine, however, has always been, since John Quincy Adams laid it down in 1817, that a gratuitous concession is that which comes within the favored-nation clause. If you give one nation some particular favor of any kind, no matter whether or not it is a lowering of duties, that comes within the favored-nation clause. I think there can be no question about the doctrine that we have always held. The only question to be decided here is whether this item, as it now stands, stripped of its equivalent, as it is by the House bill, does not come within the classification of a gratuitous concession. If it does, then this comes within the favored-nation clause.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BAILEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I wanted to follow the question I raised a moment ago, which the Senator has not touched upon very much as yet, and that is this: If our chief supply of pulp and pulp wood from Canada must come from Crown lands controlled by the Provinces, in regard to which they can in their local legislatures impose export duties, and Canada has not undertaken, through her Dominion Parliament, to answer for those Provinces, may this not be, after all, an entirely futile agreement so far as getting from Canada any considerable supply of wood pulp and pulp wood is concerned,

because the power to control its exportation into the United States is in those local Provinces?

Mr. LODGE. That is absolutely true. I was directing my remarks only to the technical question of reciprocity as applied to the treaty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true, then, that there is an immense amount of sham in this whole proposition, which is being held out to the American people as a promise for enlarging the wood pulp and pulp wood supply?

Mr. LODGE. That is too large a question for me to reply to. Mr. BAILEY and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rather agree both with the general American doctrine and with the statement which he quotes from John Quincy Adams; but this is not a gratuity. I am perfectly satisfied that it is not an equivalent, but it is still a consideration; in other words, they get unrestricted free trade in wood pulp and print paper with the United States, while we get but a limited trade there. I think it might be considered a consideration without being an equivalent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is precisely my point, if the Senator will allow me. They get free trade under certain conditions. We can not, as the matter now stands, get free trade into Canada on wood pulp or paper under any conditions, while heretofore we could get in under certain conditions, and it was an unquestionable equivalent.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not so sure, at least I am not ready at this minute to agree that there is no condition under which we might not have a limited concession from Canada, although even that I state with reserve.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator means as it stands in the House bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I can not see where the equivalent comes in.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no equivalent, but there may be a consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I mean there is no ostensible equivalent.

Mr. BAILEY. Equivalent implies value for value.

Mr. LODGE. I mean ostensible equivalent.

Mr. BAILEY. A consideration.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Texas?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Texas would study the second section of the bill as it came from the other House, without the proposed amendment. He will find that that section will take effect whether Canada adopts or rejects the reciprocity agreement, whether Canada enacts any legislation or not. The instant the President's signature is put to the bill the duties upon these articles of pulp and paper, the products of Canada coming into the United States, are removed, subject to certain specified conditions.

Mr. BAILEY. And in that contingency I think obviously every country with whom we have a treaty containing the favored-nation clause will be entitled to the same treatment, but I am contemplating a situation in which both Governments approve this treaty.

Mr. ROOT. Well, we can not tell what Canada is going to do. We can not tell whether she will enact legislation on the basis of this agreement or not; but unless this amendment to the second paragraph of that section of the bill is enacted, we establish free trade in paper and pulp without any reference to anything coming to us from Canada.

Mr. BAILEY. Under that condition I agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has intimated; indeed, I feel sure that under that condition we establish the same rights in all nations having a treaty with the favored-nation clause that we accord to Canada; but in what I have said I have assumed that the two countries would approve this treaty.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has long been asking the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to him?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I merely want to clear the point as to which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Massachusetts have been answering the Senator from South Dakota, as well as some others, in reference to what were the conditions which this proposed relation has to wood

pulp. On page 2 of the message of the President of January 26, 1911, Messrs. Fielding and Paterson outlined definitely and clearly the situation.

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. With the permission of the Senator, I ask to have that portion of the message read and incorporated at this point.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so, although I am entirely familiar with it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Some other Senators are not, and I should like to have the matter incorporated in the RECORD at this point. Without objection, I shall have it read and so incorporated, beginning at section 10, with reference to wood pulp, and going down to section 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

10. With respect to the discussions that have taken place concerning the duties upon the several grades of pulp, printing paper, etc.—mechanically ground wood pulp, chemical wood pulp, bleached and unbleached, news-printing paper, and other printing paper, and board made from wood pulp, of the value not exceeding 4 cents per pound at the place of shipment—we note that you desire to provide that such articles from Canada shall be made free of duty in the United States only upon certain conditions respecting the shipment of pulp wood from Canada. It is necessary that we should point out that this is a matter in which we are not in a position to make any agreement. The restrictions at present existing in Canada are of a provincial character. They have been adopted by several of the Provinces with regard to what are believed to be provincial interests. We have neither the right nor the desire to interfere with the provincial authorities in the free exercise of their constitutional powers in the administration of their public lands. The provisions you are proposing to make respecting the conditions upon which these classes of pulp and paper may be imported into the United States free of duty must necessarily be for the present inoperative. Whether the provincial governments will desire to in any way modify their regulations with a view to securing the free admission of pulp and paper from their Provinces into the markets of the United States must be a question for the provincial authorities to decide. In the meantime the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain. Whenever pulp and paper of the classes already mentioned are admitted into the United States free of duty from all parts of Canada, then similar articles, when imported into the United States, shall be admitted into Canada free of duty.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that last sentence—

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was absent when this debate began, and therefore I do not know just how it arose. Is the amendment reported by the committee the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been temporarily passed over by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. And therefore the debate, strictly speaking, is not on that amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the amendment itself has been passed over?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been temporarily passed over by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. While I am on my feet I want to ask one question, not for the purpose of entering into the debate, but to see whether I fully understand the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LODGE. I yield, but I should like to finish what I have to say.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator from New York say—

Mr. LODGE. I object, Mr. President, to asking a question of the Senator from New York. That can be done in the time of the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts declines to yield further.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator from Massachusetts say—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts further yield now?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CUMMINS. I really want the information, and I do not ask the question for the purpose of argument.

Mr. LODGE. If I have the information, the Senator shall have it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did the Senator from Massachusetts say or did he hear the Senator from New York say [laughter] that if the amendment which is commonly known throughout the country as the Root amendment is adopted and the bill is passed as otherwise reported by the committee, wood pulp and print paper can be imported free from all the world?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say that if this bill passes and Canada takes no

action upon it whatever the provision about wood pulp and paper will stand as a law of the United States admitting those articles from Canada into the United States under certain conditions, those conditions being dependent upon the provincial restrictions.

Mr. CUMMINS. So that section 2 will become a law and no other part of the bill will if Canada fails to act in the matter?

Mr. LODGE. Section 2 will become a law, no matter what happens to the rest of the bill, the moment it receives the signature of the President. There is no reciprocity whatever about section 2.

Mr. CLAPP. That is true of the whole bill, is it not?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not discussing that. Section 2 is an independent section, and the moment the President's signature is attached to the bill that section is the law of the United States, without regard to the action of Canada.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I question that construction.

Mr. LODGE. That is my impression. I may be wrong in my construction, but it is the construction of a good many people who have examined the subject pretty carefully.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to finish what I have in mind, and then I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts prefers not to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the waiving of this export duty is not in the nature of a reciprocal concession?

Mr. LODGE. I can not see how it is in the nature of a concession at all. We have no relations with the Provinces of Canada. The Provinces of Canada are unknown, except when they are needed to interfere with negotiations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The fact is that the testimony before the Committee on Finance shows that one reason why the manufacture of paper in the United States is expensive, and costs possibly more than in Canada, is because of the fact that the cost of the material here is higher, and one reason why the cost of the material is higher is that Canada, or the Provinces of Canada, maintain export duties. Now, I should like to ask the Senator, if that export duty is waived and those raw materials are given to our manufacturers at a lower price, whether that is not in the nature of a reciprocal concession which will benefit those manufacturers?

Mr. LODGE. Most of the restrictions are absolute restrictions. I do not think the export duties are very significant. They are mostly restrictions on the export of pulp and pulp wood, but not on paper. New Brunswick, encouraged by our legislation, has just passed a highly restrictive bill.

The point I desired to make, Mr. President, was in regard to the character of this amendment, internationally considered. As will be seen from what has been read from Mr. Fielding, he recognizes in the last sentence the reciprocal character of the agreement. He says no agreement can be made, because we ask certain things from the Canadian Provinces, and it is for them to settle that matter, exactly as if Canada came to us and we said, "We can not give you this, because the different States may not agree to it." Nobody on earth will treat with us in that way. We have to treat as a single government. Canada treats as far as she can go, and then the Provinces appear, and she says, "I can not control the Provinces." Therefore we have put in these conditions on the action of the Provinces.

The question is, Does that leave this a gratuitous concession, or can an equivalent of some sort or a consideration of some sort be worked out for it? I think it comes dangerously near a gratuitous concession. If it is a gratuitous concession, then of course it opens up the question of the favored-nation clause. If I am not misinformed, Germany and France and some other countries are already preparing to make claims under the favored-nation clause in regard to the arrangement now pending. That is a mere public rumor that I have heard.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. Conceding that it is a gratuitous concession—I do not agree that it is, as a matter of fact—but conceding that it is and it opens up to our people free paper from the world, that is an additional reason why it ought to be passed by Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, it would destroy every paper-making establishment in the United States.

Mr. BROWN. That it will open up free paper from the world is another reason why this particular section ought to be supported without amendment. As I understand the Senator—

Mr. LODGE. We can do it much more simply, without involving ourselves with other nations, by simply enacting a law without any reference to Canada making wood pulp and paper free.

Mr. BROWN. That is what I think this bill does.

Mr. LODGE. That would meet the Senator's views and there would be no international complication. I am not arguing the economic side of it at all.

Mr. BROWN. That is just exactly what I think this amendment does; but even if it goes further and does what the Senator says it would do—open our market to the paper of the world—that would be, to my mind, an additional reason for its approval. What I wanted to ask the Senator is this: He is emphasizing what would happen to us with the Root amendment defeated—

Mr. LODGE. I have only pointed out what international complication I thought might arise.

Mr. BROWN. That is the branch the Senator has been discussing. Now, I want to ask him what will be the result to the consuming public of print paper if the Root amendment is adopted and it becomes a law?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that it will have the slightest effect one way or the other, for I do not think the Provinces are going to remove their restrictions.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, that is just it; that is the truth about it. With the Root amendment adopted, the condition of the paper trade and pulp-wood trade in this country remains where it is to-day.

Mr. LODGE. No—

Mr. BROWN. That is, at the mercy of this combination.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that. I understood the Senator to ask what would happen if the bill were passed without the Root amendment.

Mr. BROWN. No; you discussed that question. Then I asked you—

Mr. LODGE. No; I have not discussed it. Let me answer, so there can be no misunderstanding. I believe, without the Root amendment, owing to the provincial restrictions, that the agreement will have little or no effect on articles from Canada—I am not speaking of other countries, but from Canada.

Mr. BROWN. I was going to say, if the other position of the Senator was right, if it opens up free paper from all the world, it would have considerable effect.

Mr. LODGE. No, no.

Mr. BROWN. Let us get to the question. What will happen to the paper trade in this country if the Root amendment is adopted?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it will have the slightest effect.

Mr. BROWN. That is the point. It will have none.

Mr. LODGE. No. I do not think it will change the situation. The Senator is asking me questions and then putting answers into my mouth.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. LODGE. I did not make such an answer as that. I say if the Root amendment is adopted, it will not change the situation except to give us reciprocity, if reciprocity is ever possible.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the Senator again (so that we will not have any more misunderstanding) what will happen to the paper trade in America if the Root amendment is adopted?

Mr. LODGE. It will benefit just as much as if it was not.

Mr. BROWN. Will it change conditions at all so far as the paper trade in this country is concerned?

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely, because if the Provinces—

Mr. BROWN. In what respect?

Mr. LODGE. If the Provinces remove their restrictions it will make paper free.

Mr. BROWN. You know they are not likely to remove them.

Mr. LODGE. Then the Root amendment will not affect it.

Mr. BROWN. That is the purpose of the Root amendment.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not. Leave out the Root amendment; keep on the provincial restrictions; and the clause is not worth a snap of your finger. The Root amendment is not going to stop anybody getting free pulp or paper. It only gives us a poor, miserable chance to put ours into Canada.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Nebraska let me ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator from Massachusetts needs assistance, I am willing he should have it.

Mr. LODGE. I do not need any assistance, nor does the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think it will take us both to answer satisfactorily the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts consent that the Senator from Texas make an inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. I do, with great pleasure.

Mr. BROWN. I consent.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska if it is not true that he is in favor of free print paper and free wood pulp from all the world?

Mr. BROWN. I am; absolutely.

Mr. BAILEY. Without any equivalent or consideration?

Mr. BROWN. I am.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator—

Mr. BROWN. Do I not have something to say about interrupting me?

Mr. LODGE. No; I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Texas. I now claim the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask a question?

Mr. LODGE. No; let me get through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yielded to the Senator from Texas. If he has concluded, I desire to resume.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to ask another question. The Senator from Nebraska says he is in favor of repealing the 10 per cent duty on wood pulp and print paper, which is used by a very small class of our people. I want to ask him now if he is also willing to reduce the duty on woolen goods from 95 to 42 per cent?

Mr. BROWN. If it will ease the mind of the Senator from Texas at all, I am glad to inform him that I shall vote at the first opportunity I have for a reduction in the tariff on woolens.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the Senator be willing to apply the same rule to woolen goods that he applies to wood pulp and print paper and put them on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. That is a question which is not before us; but I say to the Senator from Texas for his own personal gratification that I am for a very substantial reduction in the duty on woolen goods.

Mr. BAILEY. If I can record enough Senators on the other side in the same way we will have the woolen bill passed before August comes.

Mr. LODGE. If we are going to have free wood and free pulp and free print paper from all the world, and make that change in tariff law, that is all right. That is an economic proposition, and will stand on its merits, and will be perfectly fair and understood. But what I am getting at is the reciprocal element in this thing. If we are going to make a reciprocal agreement let it be a reciprocal agreement. If the present wood pulp and paper clause stands as it came from the House, it will, under certain conditions, admit pulp and paper into this country free—

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I am going to finish this sentence. I believe under certain conditions that it would come in free. But I do not believe the Provinces are going to withdraw their restrictions. That clause is valueless without the removal of the provincial restrictions.

But the Root amendment does not complicate it in the slightest degree. Putting on the Root amendment will not prevent free wood pulp and print paper, about which the Senator from Nebraska is so extremely solicitous. It will just as well with the Root amendment as without it. The Root amendment simply furnishes the reciprocal quality to that section.

I shall vote for this bill whether the Root amendment is adopted or not, because I believe, as does the Senator from New York, that it will be on the whole a beneficial measure, for reasons which I will undertake to state later, if I have an opportunity.

I only desired to-day to call attention to some of the complications involved in this particular clause and also to emphasize the fact that the Root amendment, if I may quote the language of the President, is in exact conformity with the agreement.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I am not on the Finance Committee, and consequently have not given this bill as careful study as have the gentlemen who are more directly charged with it. If I understand the Senator from Massachusetts correctly, however, it is to the effect that, as stated by the Senator from New York, as soon as this bill has received the signature of the President the articles mentioned in the second section will be free to enter from all the world.

Mr. LODGE. No; I did not say that, Mr. President; neither did the Senator from New York.

Mr. BACON. I understood the Senator from New York to say, and I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to echo it—

Mr. LODGE. I said in my opinion section 2 would become law without action on the part of Canada, not of the rest of the world.

Mr. ROOT rose.

Mr. BACON. I understood, if the Senator from New York will pardon me a moment, in order that I may not be misunderstood in what I said—the Senator from Massachusetts to be restating what I understood had been previously stated by the Senator from New York, that the moment the President's signature was attached to the bill, without further action by either Canada or this country, the articles enumerated in the second section would immediately be entered free of duty from all parts of the world.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. ROOT. I made no such statement as that.

Mr. BACON. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. ROOT. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Georgia? The Senator has combined in his statement two separate and distinct propositions which have been made. The first was the proposition that when this bill is signed the second section goes into effect and makes the articles enumerated therein free, subject to the conditions stated.

The second proposition is the one stated and elaborated by the Senator from Massachusetts—quite an independent proposition—and that is that this, being without consideration, would produce the further effect of making similar articles from the rest of the world free under the favored-nation clause.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator from New York agree with that statement?

Mr. ROOT. I do. I think it raises a very serious question under the favored-nation clause.

Mr. BACON. It was with reference to that that I particularly desired to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, and I shall be glad to have the answer either from him or the Senator from New York.

The proposition is predicated upon the assertion that there is nothing that is reciprocal. I suppose the Senator draws the distinction between that which is reciprocal and that which is conditional. Am I correct in that?

The Senator's proposition is that the products of Canada being admitted upon conditions, regardless of whether those conditions are complied with or not, it not being reciprocal, those articles enumerated in the second section will immediately be thrown open to the balance of the world under the favored-nation clause of the several treaties that we have with them, if I understand it correctly. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. ROOT. You are correct.

Mr. BACON. I repeat, I do not wish to place my judgment as of equal weight as that of the learned Senator without a more careful examination.

Mr. ROOT. I assented to the question of the Senator from Georgia; but I do not mean to express a final opinion upon that subject.

I tried to state accurately my position upon it, which is that it raises a very serious question under the favored-nation clause. I do not want to cut myself off from taking the other view if we should get into a controversy with other nations upon the subject. But it would certainly put us in a very embarrassing position with regard to the articles enumerated in the second section if other countries claimed their favored-nation rights.

Mr. BACON. Of course, if the Senator qualifies it in that way, I have no disposition to pursue the discussion at this time, because there will doubtless be a more careful and elaborate discussion of the matter hereafter. But I understood the Senator from New York, and also the Senator from Massachusetts, to have made statements based upon careful study and consideration of the effect of this provision of the treaty; and I, perhaps, am the more excused for having thought that the suggestion was based upon that careful study when I recall the fact

that the Senator from New York, when he brought it to the attention of the Senate, did so in a suggestion to the Senator from Texas, prefaced by the statement by him that if the Senator from Texas would give or had given careful study to this particular section, he, in his opinion, would find the conclusion to be such as the Senator from New York suggested.

But if it is not intended that this shall be taken as the final conclusion of the Senator from New York or the Senator from Massachusetts, and that they still hold the matter in abeyance, and we are again to have the benefit of their construction upon a more careful consideration, I am willing to pretermitt the discussion.

Mr. ROOT. My suggestion to the Senator from Texas did not relate to most-favored-nation clause at all.

Mr. BACON. It did not—

Mr. ROOT. I suggested that if the Senator from Texas would study the terms of the second section of the bill, he would find that that section would take effect independently of any action by Canada. That is all.

Mr. BACON. I do not think that is true, but I am glad to have the recent statement by the Senator from New York, because it marks the line of difference between his view and that which I myself entertain.

I think the condition precedent is certainly something which contemplates action, and this clause, if I read it correctly, does contain a condition precedent, and that is to the effect that if Canada itself or its Provinces shall have upon its statute books any provision with regard to export duties, this clause does not go into effect, and yet the statement of the learned Senator is to the effect that the minute the President signs the bill—that is his own language, possibly put a little more gracefully than I have endeavored to repeat it—without more on the part of Canada, the law will go into effect.

Now, let me read. After enumerating the various articles:

Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news-print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board.

Now, to say that, with that condition attached, the performance of which must precede the going into effect of this proposed provision of law, that provision of law will go into effect without regard to whether Canada does or has done anything, it seems to me, is untenable. It seems to me it does not go into effect the moment the President signs it. It does not go into effect at all if there are any such laws upon the statute books of Canada or any of the Provinces of Canada. Therefore when the President's signature has been attached, the inquiry will be, Are there such laws upon the statute books of the Dominion of Canada or of any of the Provinces of Canada? If the answer is in the affirmative, then the law is of no effect.

Mr. ROOT. Suppose the answer is in the negative, does not the paper come in free?

Mr. BACON. If it is in the negative—

Mr. ROOT. If the bill is signed to-morrow, and the next day an invoice is presented to the customhouse in Ogdensburg, and free entry is demanded, and there is proof that there is no export duty upon that paper or the material of which it is composed, does it not come in free?

Mr. BACON. But the Senator assumes there is none and will be none when this law is passed. If that were the case, it was not necessary to express the condition in the bill. It was the very fact that either there are now such laws upon the statute books of the Dominion of Canada, or of the Provinces of Canada, or that there was a recognition of the fact that there might be such laws thereafter, that this condition was expressed; and as long as it is expressed, it seems to me, it is illogical to say that this provision of law will go into effect regardless of whether Canada does anything or not.

Mr. ROOT. It is well known that as to a very considerable part of the paper and pulp, or the materials for the manufacture of pulp and paper in Canada, there is no restriction whatever.

Mr. BACON. That may be true.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. The Senator will pardon me just a moment further, although I believe I have the floor in my own right.

As to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, which I understand the Senator from New York to agree with, although he did not first make it, that the passage of this law would be so in conflict with the provisions in various treaties we have with other nations, generally known as the "favored-nation clause," that it would immediately throw our ports open to the entry of these articles from all nations, I can not agree with the Senator from New York in the differentiation he makes between a reciprocal concession on import duties on the part of Canada, and the condition precedent which we speak of, and which is recited in the bill. Anything which is a consideration in the reciprocal agreement relieves it from the favored-nation clause, and the performance of a condition precedent, which of itself is one of money value, to wit, the taking off of export duties, it seems to me would stand exactly in the same relation to the effect it will have upon the favored-nation clause that a reciprocal promise for the admission of certain articles free of duty would have.

There is no difference between the two in principle. A condition that certain export duties shall not be imposed is just as good as a reason why we should concede the remission of a tariff duty, as would be the promise that a certain other article should be admitted free of duty when exported from this country into that. One is a consideration, so is the other, and either as a consideration would relieve us from the criticism that it would be in conflict with the favored-nation clause.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from New York for his construction of the bill upon one phase of it. I have a very great respect, as I think others have, for his legal ability. I want to inquire whether under the bill, without the amendment, wood pulp and the other materials named in section 2 could not come into the United States free of duty provided they originated in a Province of Canada which levied no export duty. Is that the understanding of the Senator? If I have not made my question plain, it is this: There are two views that might be taken of the bill as drawn. One is that no wood pulp can be received in the United States from Canada free of duty until all our wood pulp is admitted into all parts of Canada free of duty. The other view of the bill, without the Root amendment, would be that if wood pulp originated in any Province of Canada and that Province did not levy an export duty, then that wood pulp could come into the United States free, and citizens of the United States could ship their wood pulp into that Province free. Is that the understanding of the bill without the Root amendment?

Mr. ROOT. No, Mr. President, I can not bring my mind to that view of the effect of this provision of section 2 of the bill or of the corresponding provision of the agreement. It does not seem to me that the terms of the agreement or of the bill furnish a basis for a discrimination between Provinces as such. Nothing is said about Provinces. The distinction drawn is between wood, wood pulp, paper, and so forth, which are subject to export duties or restrictions, and wood, wood pulp, paper, and so forth, not subject to restrictions. The agreement and the bill do not undertake to draw any line of Province or no Province. They make their distinction upon the treatment received in Canada by these particular articles whatever the treatment accorded, whatever the authority for it, or the basis of it may be.

The provision presented to my mind this question, whether, when the agreement says the condition is that such wood pulp and paper shall be free from import duty or restriction, it means the particular article which is presented at the customhouse on the one hand, or the class of article throughout Canada to which the thing presented at the customhouse belongs on the other hand.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. Let me proceed.

Mr. CLAPP. But there is the crucial point.

Mr. ROOT. I hope the Senator will allow me to finish my sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. ROOT. If it means the first, then any article coming from any part of Canada, from whatever Province, which is not subject to restriction or made from material that is subject to restriction, will be immediately entitled to come into this country free on the signature of the President to this bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. If it means the second, then it would be necessary for anyone who sought entry for any one of these articles to show that that class of articles was free from export duty or restriction in Canada.

Mr. REED. In all Provinces?

Mr. ROOT. In all Provinces. In neither case do I see that the line between Provinces enters. I am not prepared to say which of those views of the meaning of this agreement is the correct view. I am in doubt. I understand that the precedents in the Treasury Department of decisions upon somewhat similar statutes have been in favor of the more narrow construction, in one view a broader construction, applying the term such wood pulp and paper, sent to the particular article that is presented at the customhouse. If the course indicated by those precedents be followed, then, no matter from what Province an invoice of paper or pulp comes, if that identical paper and pulp be free from the limitation of an export duty, it comes in free.

Now I yield to the Senator from Minnesota with pleasure.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Minnesota let me finish my inquiry of the Senator from New York?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from New York intend or does he concede that the amendment he offers would change the construction of the main part of the statute, whatever that construction may be?

Mr. ROOT. Not in the least degree. I intended by the amendment only to provide that when anything comes free here it may go free into Canada, so that if the paper maker in Watertown and on the south shore of the St. Lawrence sees paper made in Canada coming into our market free, he may send his paper into the Canadian market free; and it will have no other effect whatever.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask the Senator, since that is his view, it is the contention is it not of the paper maker in Watertown that he is unable to compete now with the paper maker in Canada because of the extra cost of production? Does the Senator contend that it would do the paper maker of Watertown any good to take off the Canadian duty on his product and let it into Canada to compete with Canada's market when that same paper maker contends at least that the Canadian paper maker can drive him out of business here, because he can make it so much cheaper than the Watertown manufacturer?

Mr. ROOT. I do not know about that, Mr. President. The paper makers in Watertown have not been contending—

Mr. BROWN. The Senator mentioned Watertown, and that is the only reason why I mentioned it.

Mr. ROOT. I mentioned it because it is on the border, and I may say it is a city in my own State, where there are many thousand people dependent upon the manufacture of paper. They think if the manufacturers in Canada are entitled to send their paper to New York to sell free of duty, they are entitled to send their paper to Montreal to sell free of duty, and that was the agreement.

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. Theoretically, it is true that the paper makers in America have had the same right to an easy market in Canada that the paper maker in Canada has in America, but it is the contention, is it not, that the paper makers of America are unable to compete with the Canadian paper makers in this market, and therefore they are opposed to removing the American duty on Canadian paper. If that is true, what actual benefit do the paper makers of our country derive from having free access to the Canadian paper market?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I can not base my view of this bill upon the contention that the paper makers of America can not compete with Canadian paper makers, because I am going to vote to take away from them all protection by way of a tariff duty. What I do want is, when we take away all protection from them for the purpose of giving effect to an agreement which gives to them an entry into the Canadian market, however much or however little it may be worth, they shall have what the agreement gives them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator takes his seat—

Mr. ROOT. I will say, Mr. President, that I do not think that this amendment is of the importance which has been ascribed to it in many quarters and perhaps generally. I do not think it is a matter of the first importance, but it is an amendment which provides that our own people shall have one stipulation, valuable or not, that is accorded to them by the Canadian Government in the agreement which has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROOT. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator from New York resumes his seat I wish to call his attention to the evidence

which exists in the agreement itself that the narrow construction which he thinks might possibly be placed on the word "such" is hardly possible under other language in that same agreement.

I understand the Senator from New York to contend that it might be possible if this bill were passed as it is proposed and section 2 remains as it does now, that immediately upon its passage paper might be brought to this country from Canada, and, provided it was made of wood from a Province which imposes an export duty, then because of the narrow construction of the words "such paper" it would be subject to immediate entry into the United States.

It seems to me that that construction of the word "such" in that paragraph is not possible, for the reason that in the paragraph immediately following the same language is used, not applied to the Canadian products but applied to the products of the United States exported into Canada. The provision I refer to is as follows:

Provided also, That such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of the United States, shall only be admitted free of duty into Canada from the United States when such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of Canada, are admitted from all parts of Canada free of duty into the United States.

It is manifest from a reading of that provision that it is not possible to apply the narrow construction to the word "such" in the free-list provision, which the Senator from New York has thought possible.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I say two things regarding the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska? The first is that the clause to which he has just referred is omitted from the bill, so that there will be no such weight to the construction of this bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. However, I think that as the bill is in support of a reciprocity agreement and in view of the fact that it is to carry out that agreement, the agreement might be looked to for language to interpret this particular legislation.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if the bill did follow the agreement, but may it not well be inferred from the fact that the bill industriously departs from the terms of the agreement that it intended to do something else than the agreement.

There is a second thing which I wish to say regarding the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska. I do not say the construction which he has stated is not correct. As I have already said, I have been in serious doubt as to which of the two constructions was correct which the agreement meant; but if the construction which makes the words "such paper, pulp," apply to that class of articles be correct, then it makes no difference practically in the immediate future as to whether the amendment is put in or left out, because there would not be any results. If the construction is the true one—that there can be no restriction upon the class of articles—then nothing can come in free either with the amendment or without it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, in reply to the Senator from New York, I want to say that, so far as the export duties levied by the Canadian Provinces are concerned, their treatment in the bill is identical with their treatment in the agreement, and therefore, as far as these paragraphs are concerned, there is no departure from the agreement.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New York to what I believe to be a fact, that there is no Province in Canada that has an export duty upon paper. They have an export duty upon pulp wood and pulp, but they have no export duty upon paper. The bill provides that paper under the value of 4 cents per pound can come in free.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] discussed the question as to whether there were any restrictions in section 2 of the proposed bill. There are restrictions in the Provinces as far as pulp wood and pulp are concerned, but not as to paper itself, and therefore paper can come in free as soon as the President signs the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that paper must be made from wood not subject to such restrictions.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. The Senator may have the Canadian bill here. I do not find it in this report. I thought it was here. The Senator from New York calls attention to the fact that the clause which the Senator from Nebraska read is omitted from the bill

pending here. I wish to inquire if it has been omitted from the bill before the Parliament at Ottawa.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have already read into the RECORD to-day the provision in the Canadian bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it from the Canadian bill or the document which is before us, from which the Senator has just read?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was the document printed under the authority of the Senate containing a reprint of the Canadian bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the ship of this legislation never encounters any rocks any more dangerous than the one which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has imagined he sees under the water, and very far under it at that, she will sail on very smoothly. This for the simple reason that the entire bill as passed by the American Congress and signed by the American President in its totality will be consideration for the entire bill which will be passed by the Canadian Parliament and become a law there in its totality, and for the further reason that it took not only two parties to make this bargain, but it will take two parties to make this legislation. The trouble which is being complained of is cured by the fact of the existence of the provision desired in the legislation now pending before the Canadian Parliament. That is Canada's side of the bargain.

Mr. President, I shall not go into that much more particularly. There are some things in connection with this matter that I know the public does not understand and that I think probably some of us do not understand.

In Canada the public lands are called Crown lands. There are two different classifications of Crown lands. Some of the Provinces, the old Provinces, which entered into the original union at the time of its formation, own the Crown lands within their borders, and the Dominion of Canada has no more to do with those Crown lands than the Government of the United States has to do with the public lands of Texas, which retained its public lands when it entered into the American Union, when it was not "annexed," as that map says, but when it was "admitted."

Now, then, another classification of Crown lands are the Crown lands owned by the Dominion, which is the general or Federal Government of Canada. These exist in such Provinces as Alberta and Saskatchewan, Provinces which were territories at the time of the formation of the Dominion Union, but which have since been admitted as Provinces, or, as we would say, as States. In those cases the Crown lands are Federal lands.

Now, I do not like to argue about words. I always like to argue about things or else keep my lips closed.

If the Root amendment is adopted, wood pulp and pulp wood and paper, and principally news paper, print paper, for that is the thing which is being considered most, can not enter into the United States free of its present tax until every Province in Canada owning its own public lands shall have removed all restrictions upon exportations which those Provinces now have. In other words, the period of the free importations of print paper into the United States will be either perpetually or indefinitely postponed. That is the whole proposition.

If the Root amendment be not adopted, then, although one Province in Canada or two Provinces may maintain their restrictions under their state-rights doctrine, there recognized by the Dominion, we can still obtain print paper into the United States free from these sources: First, from privately owned timber; secondly, from Crown lands owned by the Dominion in those Provinces which were admitted as States subsequent to the formation of the Canadian Union.

Now, you can make your choice. Those of you who want indefinitely to postpone the period of the entry of print paper into the United States from Canada and wood pulp from Canada into the United States can vote for the Root amendment and you will accomplish your purpose.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute. And not only will this postponement be indefinite, but it will probably be perpetual, for these reasons: You will, with the Root amendment, furnish no sort of inducement to the Provinces in Canada desiring to retain the restrictions to remove those restrictions, and not only that, you will furnish the greatest temptation and inducement to the International Paper Trust of the United States to see to it that they never do remove those restrictions.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not right now. The bill did not come from the House accidentally. The House did not word it as it is worded without due deliberation and thought. It was drawn

this way of a set purpose, and, in drawing it, it is to be presumed, at any rate, that the State Department was more or less consulted. If the bill as it passed the House passes the Senate, then this will happen: Print paper out of wood grown upon the Dominion Crown lands and grown upon privately owned lands can come into the United States free, as can also the pulp wood and wood pulp, for the use of our paper manufacturers. This will enable our paper manufacturers to compete with those of Canada, because substantially the only advantage our neighbors have is cheaper raw material, while putting print paper from Canada into the United States on the free list will force them to compete.

Now, those of you who desire indefinitely to continue the present grip of the International Paper Co. upon the paper business of the United States can vote for the Root amendment. Those of you who desire to loosen that grip, who desire to take from the throat of the consumers of paper this great strangling hold, will not vote to put the Root amendment upon the bill.

Now, another thing. A very great deal of importance has been attached to the fact that the Root amendment—

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not right now.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator will just pardon me, I think he has misquoted. I wish to call his attention—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not right now. I will yield later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I must say in excuse that I am not accustomed to the method of debate in the Senate; I am rather in the habit of trying to finish a thought, and I want to finish it continuously if I can.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator misquoted, and I wanted to correct him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A great deal of importance has been attached to the idea that the Root amendment is in strict accord with the agreement between the two countries. Now, I always like to argue things frankly, for two reasons: First, because it is an honest thing to do; and, secondly, because it is always the wisest thing to do. The President of the United States has made no concealment of the fact that the Root amendment does express the original agreement in so far as it was an agreement at all. The House knew it expressed the agreement, and because the agreement as it was made would have resulted in exactly what I have said, perpetually possibly, indefinitely certainly, continuing the hold of the International Paper Co. upon the paper business of the country, the House changed it that far, knowing that when it changed it, it changed the agreement on the whole still further in favor of Canada, and that therefore Canada would not object.

That was the reason why the bill came here in its present shape. The President of the United States has very clearly expressed it in his speech at Chicago. By the way, I hold no brief to defend the President of the United States, and if I incidentally defend him here and there, it will be because of a difference between me and Republican Senators. When a Republican President has a lucid interval on the question of protectionism, I like to go to his assistance, and when he has a lucid interval you feel like hitting him over the head with a club. So I make that excuse, at any rate, for defending him in this particular, in so far as I shall.

It has been charged that the President made a speech in Chicago and that he did not send the speech to the Houses of Congress as a message. With the exception of Thomas Jefferson, who never made any speeches at all, but who did all his work of molding public sentiment and legislation, outside of his messages, around the dinner table and by letter, there has not been a President of the United States from the beginning who did not make speeches to the country, and make speeches upon political subjects, and make speeches for the purpose of molding public opinion.

The Senator from Texas says—I have forgotten his exact language—Oh, yes; that it was "to put pressure upon the Senate" by arousing public opinion. I would not be undiplomatic enough to say that the Republican President wanted to put pressure upon this august body, but I would say that it would not have been lese majesty if he had.

This body is not so very august that anybody, anywhere from a bootblack to a President of the United States, can not rise up and advise it. All the newspapers are advising it every day. Every time one of you makes a public speech at home and it is printed, you are putting pressure through public opinion, in a certain sense, upon both Houses, but not in any wrong or in any

bad sense. There is no blame to be attached to the President of the United States because he thinks that the enactment of certain legislation will be for the public welfare, and, believing it, tries to mold public opinion in favor of its enactment, not only in his messages, but in public speeches and even in private conversation. In so far as that be a pressure upon the Senate, it is a legitimate and a right pressure.

My friends, I learned but two things from the hearings before the Finance Committee. One was that nobody in America can in any line of business compete with anybody anywhere with the aid of Government extended in the form of taxation of his competitors.

The other was that when a man came there to plead for the retention of a tax he was treated with the utmost courtesy, as one of the distinguished citizens of the United States, probably, as one of its captains of industry; and although the retention of the tax carried money into his pocket, it was not regarded as a treasonable act on his part to beg for its retention; but if a man came before that committee begging for the tax to be reduced, immediately the exclamation was, "Why, by the reduction of this tax you will be richer," and that was regarded as a treasonable way of getting rich. We have got to about the stage where the great interests control this country so completely that a man who wants to untax the people and frankly admits by their being untaxed he as well as the people will be benefited is regarded as a fellow who has committed a sort of high treason, whereas the man who wants to retain a tax or wants to increase a tax is regarded as an enterprising captain of industry whom no man can treat too well and whom no committee can consider too highly.

Mr. President, in connection with the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], if Senators will take the trouble to begin on the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth lines of page 15 and to read down to the fourth line on page 16, and if then they will take the trouble to begin on line 15, on page 19, and read through the twenty-third line on the same page, and connect that with the language on page 23, in section 2 of this bill, they will understand what I have said about this bill being in toto a consideration for a Canadian bill in toto truly reciprocal and not anywhere gratuitous, and not subject to any criticism under the "favored-nation" clause of any treaty.

In conclusion, I beg the Senator's pardon for not yielding at the time he asked me, and shall be glad to do so now; I mean the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he understands that any Province in Canada can impose an import duty?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; no Province in Canada can impose an import duty.

Mr. CLAPP. Such a duty can be imposed only by the general Canadian Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the Dominion of Canada. If I said "import duty," I meant "export duty."

Mr. CLAPP. That is what I thought.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. These restrictions are in the shape of export duties wherever the Crown lands—or the public lands, as we would call them—are owned by the Provinces.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word further right there, for I forgot to say it at the proper time. If the Root amendment is not adopted, we hold out the inducement to several Provinces of Canada to withhold those restrictions. If we admit, for example, print paper made from wood grown upon Saskatchewan and Alberta lands free into our country, whereas we retain a duty of \$3.75—I believe that is the amount, although I may not be accurate—upon the print paper made from wood in New Brunswick, if New Brunswick be one of the Provinces with restrictions, then we hold out an inducement of \$5.75 a ton to New Brunswick to remove its restrictions in order to enter our market. The Dominion of Canada can not make her remove them; the Dominion of Canada never agreed to do it. Moreover, if Senators will mark the correspondence as well as the final so-called agreement, they will see that the minds of the two countries never came together upon the question of paper and wood pulp and pulp wood at all. One merely said, "I will try to do this, if you will do that," the first having said prior to that time, "I will do this if you will do that," and the reply was not, "I will," but, "I will use such influence as I have to get it done, and so far as I am a Dominion I will do it." That is as near as they came to a perfect agreement.

Mr. CLAPP. I am in hearty accord with the Senator, let me say, in opposing the Root amendment, because it is one more entanglement of this proposition; but I doubt whether the Senator is correct in his statement that the Root amendment goes to any action of any Province. The Root amendment simply

relates not to export duties, which are referred to earlier, but to import duties on the part of Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if the original agreement as it was made had been kept, we would not have admitted any paper that was the product of any Province with restrictions.

Mr. CLAPP. That is true.

Mr. President, I want to say at this time—and I am not going to speak at any length upon the bill—I have heard some speeches made against this bill and have read several others, but I have not heard or read any speech that satisfied me so thoroughly that this bill ought to be defeated as the effort of the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] to say what this bill meant. I invite the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to this: It is true that as to wood pulp from private-owned mills this proposition applies, and yet so learned a man as the Senator from New York, close as he must be to the source of this bill, was in doubt, as shown by his answer in response to a question, I believe, of the Senator from Missouri, as to what the bill did mean. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is correct that paper made from Crown-lands timber would come in free.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Paper made from timber on Dominion Crown lands.

Mr. CLAPP. Paper made from timber on Dominion Crown lands or made from lands in private ownership would come in free. Let us clear that question from all ambiguity by striking out the entire proviso with reference to paper. If the duty upon paper is a burden, which it is the duty of Congress to remove, then it is our duty to remove it in such a manner that there shall be no question as to whether or not we have removed it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that particular, I am heartily in accord with the Senator from Minnesota, not only as to Canada, but as to everybody else.

Mr. CLAPP. I am very glad to hear the Senator accede to that. Two years ago—to use a vulgarism, possibly—Congress gave these people a gold brick in the tariff bill. I opposed it then, and I propose to oppose it now. If we are going to put paper, as we did then, at a certain rate, or if, as the Senator from New York says, he is ready to vote to put paper on the free list if Canada will put it on the free list, which is a mere shadow dance, because last year all the paper products of this country that went into Canada only amounted to a sum total of about \$300,000, while the Canadian exports to this country amounted, of all those articles, to over \$4,000,000, but if we have reached a point where we are ready to do this, then I, for one, shall insist in the consideration of this bill, as I did two years ago, that it is not right to impose a double burden upon the American consumer. I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from Mississippi has signified a willingness to join in that proposition.

While I am on the floor I want to call attention to the fact that this debate has drifted very far from the fundamentals upon which it started under the auspices of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. His objection to this bill in its present form and to the proposed amendment was that it would give a certain class of legislation—reciprocal legislation—to certain States of this Union while it would not accord the same condition to other States. I admire the Senator's fundamental proposition as a matter of morals and ethics, but it has become somewhat antiquated in the history of tariff legislation in this country.

The Payne-Aldrich tariff act gives the State of Maine one kind of a tariff and the State of Minnesota another. Turning to page 90 of that act under section 27, you will find this provision:

SEC. 27. That the produce of the forests of the State of Maine upon the St. John River and its tributaries, owned by American citizens, and sawed or hewed in the Province of New Brunswick by American citizens, the same being otherwise unmanufactured in whole or in part, which is now admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty, shall continue for two years after the date of the passage of this act and no longer to be so admitted, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time prescribe.

The owner of pine timber in Maine under that provision has the right to float his logs across the river and there have them hewed or sawed, but when the request was made that the same privilege be accorded to the owner of pine timber in the State of Minnesota, it was denied. I do not wonder that the Senator from North Dakota may not have been accustomed to a system of tariff that accorded one privilege to the owner of pine timber in one State and denied it to another; and I simply wanted to remind him that the people of Minnesota had become somewhat accustomed to it, and that the reciprocity bill is not the first bill in the history of tariff legislation that favors one State

and withholds the same favors or privileges from the people of another State.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if at the time that bill was considered there was any objection to that provision of the bill or did Minnesota at any time ask the same privilege?

Mr. CLAPP. Minnesota asked the same privilege, and, as in a great many other instances in the consideration of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill in the open forum of the Senate, the privilege was accorded to Minnesota, but when the bill came out of that remarkable conference committee of 1909 the privilege as to Minnesota was stricken out and left standing as to Maine.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason I asked the Senator was because I remembered no act on the part of the Senate tending to show partiality between one State and another; and so it was quite a surprise to have my attention called to it to-day by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, it was a surprise to us, but we are getting accustomed to being surprised under this form of legislation. So I wanted to remind the Senator from North Dakota that he, too, must expect to tolerate conditions here and also get somewhat accustomed to this character of legislation.

I did not intend, Mr. President, to rise to debate this question this afternoon. At the proper time—and I understand the bill is now before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment—I propose to offer the following amendment: On page 23, line 19, after the word "duty," where it first occurs, to strike out the comma and insert a period and strike out all the remainder of page 23 and lines 1 and 2, on page 24, down to and including the word "board," in line 3, on page 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, after the word "duty," in line 19, where it first occurs, it is proposed to strike out the comma and insert a period, and to strike out the remainder of page 23 down to and including the word "board," on line 3, of page 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire action upon the proposed amendment at the present time?

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask whether the amendment just sent to the desk by the Senator from Minnesota was offered to the bill or proposed to be offered at some other time?

Mr. CLAPP. I offered it because I understood the bill was being considered as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. In a parliamentary sense, is the amendment pending which was brought forward by the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is to be voted upon when it is taken up. It has been reported by the committee, but action thereon has been temporarily deferred.

Mr. CUMMINS. Can other amendments be offered to the bill until that amendment is disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; under the circumstances, as long as the Senate has, by unanimous consent, deferred action upon the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, I do not want to interfere with the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota; but I wanted to know when the bill comes up again upon what the pending question will be?

Mr. GALLINGER. The question will be on the amendment reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will then be in the same condition it is now, unless in the meantime it has progressed in some manner, and the Chair hardly sees how it could progress with a pending amendment undisposed of.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not know that two amendments could be pending to the bill proper at the same time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can only be by unanimous consent, but by unanimous consent the amendment reported by the committee has been temporarily laid aside, and the Chair supposes that other amendments can be considered in the meantime.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota offered an amendment and asked that it be printed and lie on the table to be submitted later.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at this time, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I want to make a statement. Of course, it will be understood by those who have followed the text of the bill that the amendments I have submitted and asked to lie on the table, if it prevails, will simply enlarge the con-

cession, and consequently can in no wise interfere with whatever there may be of the idea of a reciprocal relation in the passage of this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. It means, does it not, that wood pulp and paper may come in free from all parts of Canada, no matter whether there are restrictions or not?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, sir; that is what it means.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present Presiding Officer was not in the chair when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] offered his amendment. The Chair understands that he offered his amendment with the request that it be printed and lie upon the table, and not for immediate action.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; but, as I understand, it has the parliamentary standing of an amendment offered to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. And takes precedence of the amendment presented by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no; not necessarily.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is a little difficult for me to understand how there can be two amendments pending at the same time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, as I happened to occupy the chair at the time, I will say that the amendment was offered in the form that amendments are offered every day, as a matter of information to the Senate. It was read, ordered to be printed, and lie on the table, to be offered later on as an amendment upon which action shall be taken. I should judge, however, that it would not necessarily be considered prior to the consideration of the committee amendment, but that it will be taken up for consideration whenever the Senator from Minnesota presents it for that purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New Hampshire has stated it exactly as I understand it, and my inquiry can be very easily answered by a reply to this further question: Suppose we were to take a vote at this moment, is there an amendment pending upon which we could vote; and if so, what amendment is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending on which a vote could now be taken.

Mr. OVERMAN. When can the vote be taken, Mr. President, on what is known as the Root amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate desires it to be taken. It has been temporarily passed over by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Was it not passed over temporarily; that is, for one calendar day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that means for to-day.

Mr. OVERMAN. For to-day only?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so assumes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the bill is before the Senate, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is being considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. I meant in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next step, naturally, would be to report the bill to the Senate, but the Chair hardly sees how the bill can be reported to the Senate with an amendment temporarily passed over without action as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say that he could offer his amendment in the Senate just as well as in Committee of the Whole, and that he would so offer it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not the amendment of the Senator from New York. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. It has got to be voted on first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been reported by the committee. The Chair presumes it is possible that the bill could be reported to the Senate with this amendment to be acted upon in the Senate, and not be acted upon primarily as in Committee of the Whole; but that can not be done, as the Chair sees the matter, except by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But it could be done.

Mr. SMOOT. There are some 15 proposed amendments that have been offered to the bill. I have them here before me, and it seems to me that they ought to be offered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator that there is no use of his being so eager about this bill. Let us have time, and each Senator will offer such amendments he may have to offer. There is no occasion for the Senator from Utah to

borrow trouble about amendments that other Senators have submitted.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not bothering myself about any amendments that anybody else has submitted. All I am troubling myself about is to have the bill considered. If we can pass it, or if it can be defeated—which I would personally like to see—well and good; but it does seem to me that we ought to consider the bill every day the Senate is in session until it is either passed or defeated.

Mr. NELSON. I am surprised to see the Senator so eager now about the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not see why the Senator should be surprised. I should like to get away from here. I will frankly say to the Senator that as soon as we can get through with the public business I would like to see Congress adjourn; and I do not see why we can not consider the bill now just as well as at any other time.

Mr. NELSON. I think we had better consider also the woolen schedule before we adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. That can be done, Mr. President, if there are enough Senators who want to consider it at this session.

Mr. NELSON. I think the woolen schedule ought to go with this reciprocity bill.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate feels that way, the Senate can have it. There is no question about its power, and it is a matter entirely in the hands of the Senate; but the reciprocity bill is now before the Senate and should be considered.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I shall not now nor at any other time seek to delay a single moment the consideration of this bill, but in so far as I can effect the procedure it must go along in an orderly way. As I understand, the committee, of which the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] is a member, reported an amendment. It is pending now before the Senate. I have some desire to submit to the Senate certain observations with regard to that amendment. I do not intend, however, to do so as a mere oration at a time when, under the rule or order of the Senate, the amendment can not be considered; and if the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Penrose] are willing to have that amendment postponed until some later day, it seems to me that it necessarily follows that they will be instrumental in postponing the consideration of the entire bill. Whenever the amendment proposed by the committee is before the Senate for consideration and for action, then I desire to submit some remarks upon it; but I object to proceeding with other amendments which concern other parts of the bill until this is disposed of, if that be my parliamentary right.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the bill having been laid before the Senate with only one amendment pending, when that amendment is laid aside for the day it carries the bill with it. No other procedure can be had. The committee amendment has been laid aside for this calendar day. It could be taken up, of course, only by revoking that action, which was by unanimous consent. The bill can not be before the Senate for action until that amendment is disposed of. So I think, in the absence of any other amendment, we have in fact laid the bill aside for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEYBURN. But could not be voted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment could not be voted on—

Mr. HEYBURN. The bill could not be voted upon until the amendment was disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not voted on in Committee of the Whole; amendments only. Then the bill is reported to the Senate with the amendments.

Mr. HEYBURN. I refer to the action in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. The question of the passage of the bill could not be taken up until the disposition of the amendment, and the amendment being laid aside for the day, it seems to me we are at a standstill except as to any other amendment that may now be brought forward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is a correct statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. Always keeping in mind the fact that this is, I think, the first time in my somewhat protracted service in the Senate when conversation was not sufficiently voluminous to fill up the gaps.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am a long way from home. I am longing for the breezes of California. I have been here now about three months. During that time, it seems to me,

the Senate has accomplished very little. I am perfectly content to remain here and do my duty so long as I see that the Senate is, in good faith, undertaking to accomplish results. I should not want to see any Senator denied the right to present his views fully upon this important question, or to see those rights abridged in any way. But it does seem to me that the time has come when we should push this business along.

I have heard a number of Senators say here that they are ready to make their speeches at any time, and I have been wondering for several days why they are not making them. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] seems to prefer to make his speech at a time when something is before the Senate. But this bill and until this morning the amendment, was before the Senate for consideration, or before the Senate sitting as a Committee of the Whole, and there is no reason, it seems to me, why these speeches should not be made. Personally I should be glad to see the work pushed along with a little more expedition than has been the case in the past.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, on that point I desire to state to the Senate that while I am advised that a number of Senators desire to speak against this bill, I have no information whatever as to when they will be ready or whether they will ever be ready.

Now, that is the situation for the Senate and the country to consider. If the Senate would agree on a day to vote on the measure, then there could be no objection to Senators taking all the time they wanted to prepare speeches and address the Senate on the measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania why he consented to the postponement of the committee amendment?

Mr. PENROSE. That unanimous consent was given either while I was out of the Chamber or it escaped my attention. I regret that it occurred, although under the circumstances I am not prepared to say that I would have objected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit me?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it was largely due—at least that governed my action in the matter—to the fact that the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] said that he intended to speak on the bill and would discuss his amendment on Wednesday immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. PENROSE. That influenced the Senate, and it was also supposed, I assume, that other Senators would be willing to discuss other amendments to the bill in question. It was never suspected or imagined that the postponement of one amendment be made an excuse to suspend the whole discussion on the measure for half a week.

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as I am concerned, I have certain amendments that I expect to propose. I do not want to propose them until after the amendment brought forward by the committee is disposed of. So it is utterly impossible for me to adjust altogether my amendments to the bill until I know what the sense of the Senate is with regard to the wood-pulp and paper amendment. I assumed this morning that we would go forward and debate and finally determine this amendment, and then I assumed that there would be other amendments proposed which would continue the debate.

I have not much sympathy with the general practice of delivering abstract orations upon this or any other bill, and when I offer such amendments as I desire to offer I expect to address the Senate with respect to them, and immediately address the Senate.

But it is too much to expect that we can prepare ourselves against the unforeseen and, as I think, somewhat extraordinary action taken in postponing the pending amendment so that no other amendment could be offered to the bill; at least, we could not foresee that any other amendment could be offered to the bill; and, as far as that is concerned, I think the chairman of the Finance Committee will have to accept the consequences of having been out of the Chamber when that order was asked and entered, and he ought not, as it seems to me, to impute any desire for delay upon the part of those of us who are not ready to accept the bill just as it is.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not desire to inconvenience any Senator, and so far as I have any influence in the progress of this bill I desire to adapt the progress of it to their convenience. But it does seem to be an extraordinary situation that the Senate, which in my 15 years' experience was never known to run out of its flow of oratory, is to-day found to be practically at a standstill in that respect, and the most careful investigation fails to disclose any Senator who with any degree of definiteness or certainty is willing to say that he will be able to proceed on the general bill or upon any phase of it during the present week.

Now, of course, I do not pretend to say that I have seen every Member of the Senate or that there are not Senators ready to go on. I simply state the result of my own investigation.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield. The Senator from Montana first arose.

Mr. PENROSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIXON. I do not believe there is a desire on the part of any Senator here to delay the debate or the vote on this bill. I personally know of several Senators who want to, and feel it their duty, to make some remarks on the bill, and I am sure some of them have been holding off until somebody had explained what this bill meant and what are the reasons to be advanced for its adoption.

Personally I had hoped to delay my remarks until the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Finance Committee, had made his speech in support of the bill, and possibly also the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. How can we go ahead with this debate in the dark? No report has been made upon it. Not a word has been said in its favor. Not a word has yet been said in the Senate in explanation of the bill by any Senator. I think many Senators here who want to discuss it would, for the purposes of being enlightened—and I say this not wholly in a jocular spirit—like to hear some Member of the Senate who favors the bill. The newspapers are filled with reports that two-thirds of the Senate for some reason or other are going to support the bill, and yet not a man has opened his mouth in this Chamber to say that it is a good bill.

I think, in deference to the membership of the Senate, the men here who are supposedly in favor of this bill, who are announced in the papers as going to vote for it, in justice to the Senate and the country, ought to give some reason for the faith that is in them.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rose to say practically what the Senator from Montana has just said. I am ready to proceed at any time, and I am simply waiting for the opportunity to answer, or attempt to answer, some speech made in behalf of the bill. I have not prepared what I intend to say, but if there is a speech to be made in favor of the bill I am ready to proceed as soon as that is concluded.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WORKS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas what he is going to do if no speeches are made in favor of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Then I shall endeavor to expose the vices of the bill, without having an opportunity to answer, as I think I could answer, any argument that can be made in favor of it. If it is announced that no friend of the measure desires to address the Senate in behalf of it, then the few of us who are opposed to it are ready to proceed, or at least I am. I do not know how many Senators on this side agree with me in opposing the bill, as it has never been my habit to canvass the Senate, but I am frank to say that the fewer they are the more certain I will be to express my opinion upon it. If I could have all the Democrats in accord with me I would be perfectly willing that they should make the argument and I would save myself that labor and that trouble.

Whenever the Senator from Pennsylvania is ready to say to the Senate that the advocates of the measure do not desire to discuss it, then we will proceed to discuss it, and when we have finished we will be ready to vote.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that he may possess his soul in patience; for he has no chance to see the Senate adjourn until it has, in one way or another, disposed of the free-list bill and the woolen schedule, with such other bills as the House under its prerogative may see fit to send us. But I will also say to him and to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that if they will report the free-list bill and the woolen bill as they have reported this, without a recommendation, then we are ready, and I think I may safely speak for all this side, after a fair debate—and that does not mean a long debate—on all three of the measures, to take a vote. I will go even further and say that I will exert my good offices to procure a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill on a given day, coupled with an agreement to vote on the free-list bill and the woolen bill on succeeding days, allowing only a fair interval between them for debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the Senator from Texas will not overlook the bill for publicity of campaign contributions before election.

Mr. BAILEY. I assume that there will be no effort to prevent a vote on that. I am simply addressing myself now to these bills which relate to the tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. I can say to the Senator from Texas that I am as aware as he is that if a majority of the Senate wants to vote on the free-list bill, the Senate will do it. So as to the woolen bill.

As to what the committee will do with the two bills I am not advised, nor can I say what the result of the committee vote will be. But my opinion is, of course, that there will be a majority vote against them.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure of that, Mr. President—just as sure of it as I am that there was a majority against reporting the reciprocity bill. And all I ask is—and I will make a contract with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] here in the open Senate—I think they ought not to be made at all unless they can be made in the open Senate—that if they will agree to vote with us to report those two bills without recommendation, as this bill was reported, then I will agree upon any reasonable day for a vote on this bill.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether he thinks it would be fair to report the free-list bill without giving such full hearings as the committee very patiently gave to the opponents of the reciprocity bill?

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will make the calculation he will discover that if he gives the same hearings on the free-list bill that he did on the reciprocity bill it will be later than the 1st of August before the free-list bill finds its way into the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, or even later, Mr. President.

Mr. BAILEY. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to remain here. I do not consider Washington a very desirable summer resort, but having undertaken this work I am not at liberty to consult my personal comfort, and I am ready to stay here through August or until the next session convenes. But the Senator from Utah, as I understand him, is solicitous for an adjournment, and I am showing him the way to it. We will dispose speedily of this bill; and all I want is an agreement with the Republicans on that committee for a report on the other bills.

Mr. SMOOT. I will frankly say that I do not want a vote upon any free-list bill or upon the wool bill until we get a report from the Tariff Board, and when that report is received and submitted to the Senate I am perfectly willing to consider any bill for the revision of the tariff and base that revision upon whatever that report may be.

Mr. BAILEY. I can well understand that the Senator from Utah should distrust his information on the woolen schedule, in view of the fact that he helped to frame that of the present law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As to the suggestion of the Senator from Utah that he is prepared to vote on the other schedules of the tariff law when the Tariff Board reports—

Mr. SMOOT. Not vote, Mr. President—to consider.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, I misunderstood the Senator. I thought he said to vote.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That he would then be ready to vote. I want to say I will not be ready to vote for it—

Mr. SMOOT. Vote for or against it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Unless the changes recommended by the Tariff Board appeal to my judgment—

Mr. SMOOT. Nor would I.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As to what ought to be done.

Mr. SMOOT. Nor would I. The information they are gathering ought to be in the possession of the Senate, and I think it is proper for the committee to wait until they receive that information.

Mr. BAILEY. We have made many tariff bills in the history of this country without the aid of a tariff board. We have made some bad and some worse since the war, and I think we could afford to reverse the process, and instead of raising them or leaving them as they were, which has produced so much dissatisfaction, we might try a reduction, and see if that will not produce a different state of public mind.

Mr. SMOOT. We have a number of times tried a reduction, I will tell the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. There has been only one attempt at a real reduction.

Mr. DIXON and others addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Montana, and then I will resume the session with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I heard what the Senator from Utah, a member of the Finance Committee, said about undertaking the revision of the other schedules, and not being willing to go into it until the Tariff Board had made a report. I merely want to inquire whether or not the Tariff Board made a report on Canadian reciprocity.

Mr. SMOOT. The Tariff Board has only made, I was going to say, a partial report—

Mr. DIXON. On Canadian reciprocity?

Mr. SMOOT. On the question of paper, and also some other reports in relation to some other items. But I want to say that if the Canadian reciprocity bill depended upon my vote in any way, shape, or form, it never would be passed.

Mr. DIXON. I want further to ask the Senator from Texas why he limited his inquiries to the woolen schedule and the free-list bill passed by the House?

Mr. BAILEY. Because they are the only bills now in shape for consideration.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say to the Senator from Texas that when Canadian reciprocity, or free trade for the farmers of the Northwest especially, has become a law, and when I see the Members and Senators from the great manufacturing States of this country going on record to put practically every article produced in my State on the free list—

Mr. GALLINGER. Not all of them.

Mr. DIXON. Not all of them, I am corrected by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am proud that some of them are not. I want to say to the Senator from Texas that there are Senators on this side of the Chamber who always counted themselves pretty good protectionists and who believe in protection to all and not to special interests and special communities—whenever the corner stone is pulled out of the protective tariff system by placing the farmers in a free-trade market, so far as what they sell is concerned, and the attempt is made to make them purchase in a highly protected market everything they buy, there are some votes on this side of the Chamber—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Several of them.

Mr. DIXON. Several of them, as a Senator in my rear suggests, men who have been counted pretty good protectionists, will not be greatly adverse to taking up the chemical schedule and the iron and steel schedule and the cotton schedule and every schedule in the list—

Mr. BAILEY. If we can be assured of enough Republican votes to pass it, we will take one of these bills and make an entirely new tariff bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I want to suggest to the Senators from Montana and Texas that the proper way to compromise this thing is to attach the free-list bill and the wool bill to the Canadian reciprocity bill. Then we can agree on putting the entire measure through.

Mr. DIXON. So far so good. But I want to add the iron and steel schedule and the chemical schedule and the cotton schedule to Canadian reciprocity, and then we will vote.

Mr. BAILEY. This is the most gratifying session of the Senate that I have attended during my 10 years of service, and I can well understand how the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Minnesota feel about this bill. I regard it as an abandonment of the doctrine of both parties. It is neither consistent with the system of protection nor with the system of a revenue tariff.

It exposes the farmer to the competition of his Canadian neighbor, and it repeals the duties on two commodities which raise the greatest revenue, according to the rate, among all the 4,000 subject to a duty. It repeals the 7 per cent duty on lumber, which raises annually a million two hundred thousand dollars. There is not a single item in all the 4,000 subject to a duty with a rate as low as that on lumber which raises as much revenue, and yet we are urged in the name of a Democratic revenue tariff to repeal it.

The next item which raises the most money at the lowest rate is wood pulp. It raises more than \$1,100,000, and yet I am commanded in the name of a Democratic revenue tariff to repeal a 10 per cent duty that contributes more than a million dollars annually to the public expenses. Those duties ought at least to stand until the 95 per cent average duties of the woolen schedule have been reduced to a rate approaching them.

Mr. President, these hearings which the committee have held abound in denunciation of the Paper Trust. I saw a gentleman

stand there and demand the repeal of the tax on print paper as a punishment of the trust, and yet, sir, he coupled that demand with the further demand that the tax shall be taken off of wood pulp. To feed it free raw material is a new way to punish a trust.

Assuming that there is a Paper Trust, the sum of this transaction will be to reduce the cost of the manufacture of its product about in the same proportion that it will reduce its selling price; for this bill couples free raw material for the Paper Trust with the free paper itself. Indeed, sir, it not only proposes to repeal our tariff duty on the raw material of this Paper Trust, but it is so drawn as to coerce the Canadian Provinces into abrogating their export tax on it; and thus this Paper Trust is to have the benefit not only of a remission of the duties which we now collect, but it is to have also the benefit of the remitted export tax now levied by the Canadian Provinces.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that the same party who was complaining most bitterly of the Paper Trust made a statement that it would make a difference to the one man or set of papers in this country of \$600,000, and that the paper would not be sold to the people of the United States for a cent less if they had free print paper or pulp wood; and he himself admitted that his gains last year amounted to nearly \$200,000.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true, Mr. President, and when finally pressed I think the record will show that the same gentleman admitted that his own newspaper paid a Federal corporation tax on \$187,000 net profits last year.

Now, this gentleman, an excellent gentleman, no doubt, but biased by his own self-interest, stood in the presence of the committee and declaimed against the Paper Trust, and at the same moment demanded free raw materials for it. The duty he now pays on his print paper is 10 per cent; the duty that every laborer who works for his paper pays on his woolen clothes now averages 95 per cent; and a Democratic House, under the stress of a revenue necessity, was not able to reduce those duties below 42 per cent. In God's name, Mr. President, when did it come to pass in this country that a man whose net profits total \$187,000 shall be heard to complain of a 10 per cent duty, while the laborers who work in his establishment are compelled to pay a tax averaging more than 40 per cent on the clothes they wear? Is this the rule according to which Democrats expect to frame a revenue tariff?

Mr. President, this bill takes the tax off of hay, on which we collect \$386,000 annually, and yet it leaves a tax on everything which the farmer must use in making and marketing his hay. Three hundred and eighty-six thousand dollars of revenue is remitted, and yet the farmer is sent into his meadow to cut his free hay with a taxed mower, to rake it with a taxed rake, to stack it with a taxed stacker, to bale it with a taxed baler, and then he must haul it to town in a taxed wagon. And this, sir, notwithstanding the fact that the Government of the United States collects 20 times as much on Canadian hay as it collects on Canadian mowers, rakes, stackers, balers, and wagons all combined. Can we be told that it is Democratic to take the tax off of the hay which the farmer sells and still leave it on the implements which he must buy to make it? It is small wonder, sir, that gentlemen like the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Minnesota rebel against such a discrimination.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has called attention to the revenue which is derived from hay. It is very considerable. But if this so-called reciprocity agreement becomes a law, I can assure the Senator that there will be no revenue coming from hay in the future; and not only that, but the American producer of hay will suffer a loss that somebody will hear from. I have here—

Mr. BAILEY. I hope it will be the Republican Party, whose President negotiated this treaty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely it will be, so far as this bill is concerned; but if the Senator gets his woolen scheme through, putting wool practically on the free list and reducing the manufactures of wool, I think the Democratic Party will share the discomforts.

Mr. BAILEY. We will take our chance on that.

Mr. GALLINGER. You did in 1892 and 1894.

Mr. BAILEY. We are not now proposing to repeat the folly of 1894.

Mr. GALLINGER. And you put your party out of power.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it will not surprise me to see any party which applies its doctrine of tariff taxation unequally and unjustly driven from power.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in that declaration. What I wanted to call the Senator's attention to was a report which the Senator can find in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, recently printed, from Consul Frank Deedmeyer, at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, on this question, where he says:

There are now available in Prince Edward Island—

That is a little Province of the Dominion of Canada; we do not think it amounts to very much—

There are now available in Prince Edward Island for shipment to the United States, if freed from tariff duties, 2,000,000 bushels of oats, 100,000 bushels of seed oats, and 150,000 tons of hay, and at the average rate of production maintained during the last five years Prince Edward Island will have for export during the year 1911 100,000 tons of hay, 2,000,000 bushels of oats, 100,000 bushels seed oats, and 75,000 bushels of wheat.

So, if this so-called pact goes through, not only will we lose our revenue from the hay which is brought into this country, but the farmers who are producing hay—and we produced last year in the little State of New Hampshire 780,000 tons—will be deprived to a considerable extent of a profit they have a right to expect if tariff duties are, as the Senator suggests they ought to be, equally distributed on all products and on all industries.

Mr. BAILEY. With a diminishing demand for horses in the work and pleasure of our great cities, the demand for the farmers' hay must correspondingly diminish; and with our supply supplemented and augmented by Canadian importations the price must constantly diminish, or we must relatively curtail our production until we reach a point where the increase in our population is so great that the demand for meat will neutralize this decreased consumption of hay.

Mr. President, I can understand how a man can be a protectionist; and gentlemen who think that they can answer, without effort, the arguments of Alexander Hamilton and Henry Clay are more confident of their capacity than I am of mine. I have more than once in my life found it difficult to frame in my mind an answer altogether satisfactory to some of the arguments which the advocates of protection have advanced; but after considering it up and down until I worked it out, I have no doubt that the best argument lies with those of us who oppose the system of protection. I go so far as to say that if all industries could be permitted to produce on a free-trade basis of cost they could then afford to sell on a free-trade basis of price. There would, of course, be some exceptions. There are some unimportant industries which, in my judgment, would perish, but the capital and labor now employed in them could be more profitably employed in other enterprises just as useful, and the aggregate wealth produced by our people would, in the end, be greater than that produced under this system of protection. But while I believe that, and I would not fear to vote that conviction into a law, I am satisfied that there is no useful industry in this land that can produce upon a protection basis of cost and then market its products upon a free-trade basis of price. If the American Congress subjects any industry to the competition of the world when it comes to sell, and yet compels it to make its purchases at a price enhanced by a tariff, that industry can not survive.

Wise and just as our doctrine of a revenue tariff is, I do not believe it possible to apply it to some industries and free trade to others without working an injustice and a discrimination that must finally culminate in disaster. Under the enormous scale of Federal expenditures now, a tariff for revenue only must of necessity be higher than the fathers of protection advocated in the early days of this Republic, and a large number of men who have heretofore favored protection have come to believe that tariff for revenue affords all the protection that any industry requires; and in a contest between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff I have no shadow of doubt, sir, that a safe majority of the voters of this Republic would support our doctrine.

But, Mr. President, I would fear the result if we allow our adversaries to shift the issue and invoke the popular judgment upon the question of free trade as against protection; and especially would I fear the result if we obscure and complicate the question by advocating a tariff policy which does not operate equally and fairly upon all classes, all sections, and all industries. They shall not, if I can prevent it, excuse the injustice of their policy by assailing the inequality of ours. If we are foolish enough to apply one rule to the American farm and

another rule to the American factory, then we will lose our advantage in the argument, and with it we will lose the favor of intelligent and justice-loving men.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I want to say that the argument of the Senator from Texas, to my mind, is unanswerable. But, at the same time, has not the party of tariff for revenue only done exactly that thing in its vote in the House, by nineteen-twentieths of the vote—removing every vestige of duty on everything the farmer raises? Under this so-called Canadian reciprocity agreement, is not the other side of the Chamber at this time prepared, with the exception of four or five Democratic Senators, to commit the same heresy?

Mr. BAILEY. Canadian reciprocity, Mr. President, is not a party question.

Mr. DIXON. Yes; I admit it is not a party question.

Mr. BAILEY. A Republican President negotiated it.

Mr. DIXON. The Democratic Party is supporting it. Is not that true?

Mr. BAILEY. That, I regret to say, is true; and I think it is a mistake, but all men make mistakes. Our virtue is that we only make an occasional mistake.

Mr. DIXON. But it is an awful one when you do make it.

Mr. BAILEY. Generally the magnitude of a mistake is in proportion to the infrequency of it.

This can not be made a party question unless you are ready to say that your President has come over to our party, because he inaugurated this agreement with Canada. If there is any party advantage in it, your party will obtain it, for I assume that the President will be your next nominee. I understand that he has been composing Republican differences, and you have now about reached the point where the old ticket of Taft and Sherman will be renominated. If that happens, then what advantage can the Democrats hope to derive from this legislation? The assistant never derived any advantage as against the principal. Therefore if this is a wise measure the Republican President who inaugurated it will reap the benefit of it. Then let us agree that if it is not a wise measure the Republican President and his party ought to suffer the odium and the injury of it, instead of trying to shift the responsibility of it to the Democratic Party. That seems fair, even so fair that the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon] nods his assent to the proposition. I am content that President Taft shall have all the advantage of it because he inaugurated it. I only insist that if it does not bring good results, and it will not, he shall suffer the disadvantage.

If the price of wheat in the United States falls next year, it will be attributed to this treaty, for this treaty is going to pass, unless some more sturdy threats like that of the Senator from Montana, seconded by several other Senators on that side, shall deter the Republican majority and the Republican administration. If this treaty passes and wheat falls 10 cents a bushel, then all we will need to do is to nominate some man for the Presidency who can read and write [laughter], and we will carry those Northwestern States, for no matter if other causes operate, the people there will simply witness the result and they will hold your party responsible for it. If the price of wheat does not fall, then you will use that circumstance as a refutation of the Democratic claim that a reduction in the tariff on any article will reduce the price of that article. You will ask the farmer, Did we not take the tariff off of wheat, and is not wheat as high as before? Many of the people will not stop to take into consideration that there are many other causes which enter into the question of price besides the tariff, and they will judge by the result which is plainly before their eyes.

My own opinion is, Mr. President, that the effect of this treaty will be to enhance the price of certain articles in Canada and to reduce the price of those same articles in the United States. Under the treaty of 1854 it is probably true that the whole effect was expressed in a rise of Canadian prices. There is a report extant which shows that almost immediately after the enactment of that treaty the price of wheat rose in Canada to a level with the price of wheat in the United States. But it must be remembered, sir, that the Canadian surplus then was insignificant as compared with that of to-day. Therefore it could well have happened that the price of a small Canadian surplus, with the barrier obstructing its flow into the United States removed, would immediately rise to a level with American prices. But the Canadian surplus is now a larger per cent of the crop than ours; indeed, sir, it was larger last year, bushel for bushel, and it is therefore inevitable that this bill will produce an effect upon the price of wheat in both countries, raising it in Canada and lowering it in the United States, until an equilibrium is established; and whatever the Canadian farmer gains the American farmer will lose. Let us remember that

out of the proceeds of their wheat our farmers must purchase all other commodities, and let us compensate them by a reduction in the price of those other commodities. In that way we can do them justice. In no other way is it possible; and if the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Crawford] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Clapp] will give us five Republican votes—

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to inquire—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BAILEY. I want to state my proposition first, but if you will accept it before I state it, all right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the Senator will offer his free-list bill as an amendment to this bill, and give us a chance to deal with all sections fairly in settling this question—

Mr. BAILEY. I intend to offer the free-list bill as an amendment to this bill, but not exactly as it passed the House. I am going to eliminate—as I did when I offered it in committee—all agricultural products. It did not seem to me much of a compensation to the farmer for the loss which the Canadian treaty will inflict upon him to put him in competition with the balance of the world.

Mr. DIXON. Will the Democratic Senators support that as an amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. I can not speak for all Democratic Senators; but I will tell you what I will do. I will obligate myself to get enough Democratic votes to adopt that amendment if you will obligate yourself to give us enough votes to pass the woolen bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. DIXON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. To the Senator from Montana first.

Mr. DIXON. I want to say to the Senator from Texas, with a great deal of admiration for his logic, which, as I said, is almost unanswerable, here is Canadian reciprocity that puts nearly every product of the farm on the free list. Then you are going to follow it up by a so-called free-list bill. The trouble with that is that by the one reported in the House you place some of the farmers' additional products in the free-list bill.

Mr. BAILEY. We will eliminate that provision—

Mr. DIXON. And you crucify the farmer still further. Then when it comes to the House wool bill, reported in a Democratic House, it will bankrupt 500,000 sheepmen west of the Missouri River. With all these blessings falling on the farmer in one year I do not know what is going to become of him.

Mr. BAILEY. We will save him, if you will help us. I shall move to reduce the average duty on woolen goods to 30 per cent and raise the duty on wool to 30 per cent.

Mr. DIXON. It will approach me with a great deal of diplomacy when you do that.

Mr. BAILEY. That will compel the woolen manufacturer to pay the same tax to the Government when he imports his wool that the American laborer and farmer must pay on their woolen goods.

Mr. DIXON. I can not see why the Democratic woolen bill reported in the House gives to the sheep grower 20 per cent and when it comes to the manufacturer gives him 45 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. It simply continues a Republican inequality.

Mr. DIXON. But while you had the power and the votes to do it, why did you not correct it? Still you protect the manufacturer by double the duty that the sheep grower gets.

Mr. BAILEY. I have just stated my purpose to obviate that criticism.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. While the House cut the duty on wool less than half, it cut the average duty on woolen goods more than half.

Mr. BAILEY. The House reduced the duty on woolen goods at the rate of about 53 per cent and it reduced the duty on wool at the rate of about 55 per cent.

Mr. DIXON. That is in percentages, of course. As a matter of fact, the woolgrower will get only 50 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. You know how that happened. While the Republican Party pretended to offer the manufacturer and the woolgrower equal protection, it concealed under specific and compound duties a gross favoritism to the manufacturer.

Mr. DIXON. There is no doubt about that. I want to say further to the Senator from Texas that if the Democratic side of this Chamber will agree to submit a free-list bill as an

amendment to the reciprocity bill now pending and enlarge it a whole lot, and will offer it in good faith here in this Chamber, I think it will have enough votes on this side of the Chamber to write it into the bill.

Mr. REED. But will the Senator support it if it is added on, and will the others he speaks of support the bill when thus amended?

Mr. DIXON. I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Missouri. The free-list bill reported is just as much an abortion as the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Not as reported. It has not been reported.

Mr. DIXON. I am a protectionist. I have never had any apology to make to my own conscience or to my constituents. I would not want to be guilty of precipitating the crime. I will say to the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Missouri, if Canadian reciprocity becomes a law, you can not make the free list too wide or too long to suit a whole lot of Republican Senators who have been in their own mind pretty good protectionists.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, that almost reconciles me to reciprocity. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED and Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom, if any one, does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, and will then yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Montana [Mr. Dixon] who just took his seat a very plain and simple question. I did not get an answer that seemed to me either plain or direct. The Senator said that he could get enough votes to amend the reciprocity bill and add a free list larger than that of the other House, and write it into the law, but he subsequently changed that phrase to "write it into the bill." I want to know if the Senator means to say that he can get enough votes from the Republican side of the Chamber to amend the reciprocity bill and add a free list larger than that of the House, and then command those same votes to pass the bill as amended?

Mr. DIXON. I will answer the Senator from Missouri by saying that I am not speaking for my Republican colleagues; I carry none of their votes in my pocket or under my control; but here is the cruel and unjust situation of the Senator from Missouri, judging generally by his remarks. He is prepared to announce that he is going to support Canadian reciprocity, which removes practically every vestige of protection so far as the farmer is concerned, and yet at the same time he refuses, according to his practically preannounced plan, to support the free-list bill as an amendment to the Canadian reciprocity bill. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri this question: Will he support the free-list bill as an amendment to the bill now pending and give the farmer, from the Senator's standpoint, a square deal?

Mr. REED. I will support the free-list bill as an amendment to the proposition now pending the very moment you will give us enough votes from that side to pass the bill as thus amended.

Mr. DIXON. Oh!

Mr. REED. Of the Chamber to pass the reciprocity bill as amended by the free-list bill; but—

Mr. DIXON. In other words, you place your conscience in the keeping of the Republican side of the Chamber.

Mr. REED. But I will not join a band of legislative assassins who propose to kill the bill by amendment.

Mr. DIXON. No; but you do propose to place your political morals in the keeping of the Republican side of the Chamber by striking down the farmers' protection and at the same time refusing to extend any aid from your standpoint to the free-list bill.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana is mistaken. I propose to vote for reciprocity, and I propose, and the Democrats propose, unless we are prevented by the majority, to then give to the Senator who is on his feet, and to all other Senators, the chance to show whether or not they are in good faith when they claim they want to take care of the farmers by giving them a farmer's free-list bill to vote for. When that question comes up, as it will come up, I predict, if we have to sit here all summer, gentlemen who now claim to love the farmer so much will have an opportunity to demonstrate their affection.

Mr. DIXON. But the program of the Senator from Missouri will amount to just this in practical politics: By your vote, under the guise of Canadian reciprocity, you are going to take off whatever protection the farmer now has, the Senator from Missouri well knowing that, as certain as the sun rises east of the Capitol to-morrow morning, when that is done your free-list bill is deadlier than Hector and will never see the daylight.

Mr. REED. I do not agree to that proposition; but so that my own position may be properly understood, I say now, as I have always said, that, taken in the main, the protective tariff

upon the farmers' products is a mere subterfuge and a fraud. I am willing to vote for reciprocity because I do not believe it will injure the farmer, and because I believe it will benefit the country in general.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Missouri answer me how it can benefit any class unless it does so at the expense of the farmer?

Mr. REED. Answering the Senator from Texas—and I do not desire to get into a debate with him on this question at this time—I will say I believe that an extension of trade and of commerce between this country and any other country that is inhabited by the same kind of people that we are, which has the same kind of soil, which has substantially the same kind of climate, except not so advantageous, which was made by the same God at the same time, and is divided from us only by the imaginary line on a map, will result in benefit to all the people of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota, and then I will yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, for the purpose of lending what little encouragement I may to the prospects here for some cooperation, I want to say to the Senator from Texas, speaking only for myself, but I believe in a large measure speaking for many people in the Northwest, that when we find Senators representing the great States of Pennsylvania and New York and Connecticut and Massachusetts and Maine, sections of the country that owe more to the protective tariff than any other portions of these United States, advocating a measure here which proposes to put upon the free list every article that is produced in the States in the Middle West, we want one killing while we are at it.

Mr. BAILEY. We will help you officiate.

Mr. DIXON. In other words—

Mr. CRAWFORD. And, if the Senator will permit me, speaking for myself, I will say very frankly that I want to deal with this matter in its entirety rather than have it come here in a half dozen different forms.

Mr. DIXON. In other words—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a moment. If the Senator will prepare an amendment reducing the duties on manufactured articles, particularly articles that are largely used by the country people, and putting on the free list articles commonly known as agricultural implements, so that I can see in his amendment some compensation for what we are asked to give up here in the passage of this bill, I will take delight in going on record in the presence of these Senators from these highly protected manufacturing sections of our country in voting for it and doing what I can to see it pass, because it is a foregone conclusion that unless we can get that we have got to take this. With a great administration backing it, with nine-tenths of the Members on the other side of the Chamber standing for it, and with the Representatives of highly protected manufacturing districts on this side of the Chamber standing for it, we have got to take it; and if we must take it or an amended bill, with your reduction of woollens and cottons and free agricultural implements attached to it, you can have my support.

Mr. DIXON. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator from South Dakota means that he does not think it a square deal to have us participate here in a cannibalistic feast—one section of the country eating up the other at the same time; in other words, the Senator from South Dakota, I think, means—at least some other people do—that when Pennsylvania and Mississippi and Massachusetts strike hands on a political economy propaganda some other portions of the country are going to start out on their own hook, so far as political economy is concerned, and we might as well understand it from the beginning of this debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reference to Massachusetts and Mississippi—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi wanted to make one remark in defense and excuse simply for himself. He does not now, in view of that last remark, feel aggressive at all. He has a broken and contrite heart, although he has not the full repentance. I do confess that I do feel badly for Mississippi when I find her temporarily in that sort of company, even when we are all going to the right place. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to consider for an instant, if the Senator from Texas will permit me—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Michigan wait a moment until I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, who wants to interrogate the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] has answered, so far as he is concerned, the question which I desired to propound to the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON], whether, if the reciprocity agreement passes the Senate as it now stands and becomes a law, the Senator from Montana would then vote for a free-list bill, or would he insist that it be attached to this agreement? I think, if the Senator from Texas will keep the doors of the church open for a few moments longer, we shall have enough converts to do as we please concerning this legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, in the hope that the Senator from Michigan will join us, I yield to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to advert for a moment to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that this is a good thing to do; that this vast territory, peopled by kindred folk and along our border, should be extended the unusual privilege of membership in the American Union as a State, and at the same time have the protection of one of the greatest powers in the world—a rival of ours in our industrial and commercial welfare. I ask if it is fair or just to handicap the American farmer, to tax him for the schools, to tax him a hundred million dollars for the Army, one hundred and forty millions for the Navy, and one hundred and fifty-five millions for pensions annually, none of which are to be borne by the Canadians, who are placed upon an equality with him upon this market, while one of the greatest naval powers of the world stands perpetual guard over Canada's welfare in her relations with the other countries of the earth, without a burden to bear? Yet you propose to ingraft her into the Union with all the privileges of statehood, and to allow her to maintain her attachment of kinship and relationship with the great power across the sea. I denounce that as an unfair deal; I protest against it in the name of equality and justice to the men who have made this country independent of European control; I denounce it in the name of the men who have carried our flag upon every field of battle, who have brought honor to our arms, and dignity to our citizenship. It is unworthy of any Senator, North or South, to admit into the Union aliens with no obligations to our country at all, who cross over our border at daybreak and leave it as the sun goes down, without a single duty to our country or our flag, and to place them upon an equality with the everyday citizen of this Republic who has all these burdens to bear.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the Senator think we could overcome all those objections by annexing Canada, and would it not be better to annex those three Provinces shown on the map on the wall? They would form a good addition to North Dakota and Minnesota, and even to Michigan.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire about their habits and their politics before I consented to that.

Mr. NELSON. Michigan has an island in Lake Superior not far from Port Arthur, and that place would be very near if you could annex it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the suggestion of annexation is most interesting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If we had no one to deal with but Canada, if Canada stood on her own bottom, if she were unattached to any European State, if she thought as we think and lived as we live, there would be little trouble in a commercial union with a great country like that upon our border; but it is idle to talk of annexation or commercial union with that country so long as England keeps her control over Canada. Her control is as active and strong and powerful and potential today as it ever was. Only day before yesterday the brilliant premier of Canada said in the presence of other distinguished statesmen of the British Empire around a coronation table, where they met for conference, that there would be nothing done inimical to England and her relations to the Dominion, and, in my humble judgment, nothing of that kind is being done

by this treaty. It is a straight, square, unadulterated gift of the American market to the producers of the soil of Canada without a compensating fixture to our own people.

Mr. President, the suggestion of reciprocity with Canada has been made over and over again to this Government, but no great American statesman in 50 years has been willing to risk his reputation on a proposition like this. For over 50 years Canada has been knocking at our door with this identical proposition. We put it upon the statute books in 1854, and it remained for the immortal Lincoln among the first acts of his administration to strike it down, because of its unfairness to our countrymen. They approached President Grant with dulcet tones and tried to get him into such an arrangement, but he tore it into tatters. They then went to President Harrison and to his Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, without effect. They tried to raise it in connection with the Alaska Boundary Commission; they tried to get in on us every year. It is the voluntary proposition of Canada. We have never been obliged to seek this privilege from the people of Canada. They have knocked at our doors, but they have never been heard, and the wisest statesmanship that has governed this Republic in 50 years has been deaf to the pleadings of the Canadian farmer who, with his 54 per cent of surplus agricultural products, has always sought this market as the best place in the world in which to sell what he raises upon his farm.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan rose to ask a question. It is the longest question I have ever heard. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is no more puzzling than questions the Senator has considered again and again, if he has adjusted himself to the acrobatic performances of his own party in Missouri and throughout the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I do not know about acrobatic performances; but I do know that the Democratic Party on this proposition is standing on substantially the ground it has stood upon for many years, and I do know—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Pardon me just a moment. I do know that the party of the Senator is to-day torn into as many different elements and factions as there are Members on the other side.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And we have been able to beat the Senator's party, even in factions.

Mr. REED. Yes. I expected to see gentlemen on the other side before this debate was ended wrap themselves in the folds of the American flag and shout loudly of patriotism. I never yet saw a Republican driven by the shafts of logic to the point of despair but he would grab the American flag and wrap it about his body, and say, "Look at that; I own it."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; that is our privilege—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator must not interrupt without first addressing the Chair and getting the consent of the Senator having the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REED. If he had a question I would, but he has a speech.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and I am going to utter it, but not in the Senator's time.

Mr. REED. The Senator speaks about the American farmer paying school taxes. Does not the Canadian farmer who competes with him pay school taxes? The Senator speaks about the American farmer paying taxes to support the American Government. Does not the Canadian farmer who competes with him bear the burden of taxes? The question is not under what flag these people live; the question to be determined is, What will be the result of trading with them? It will make but little difference to the man who eats a loaf of bread in this country whether the wheat was raised under the flag of England or of Canada or under our own flag. So far as that bread is concerned, it is with the consumer a question of nutrition and price, not the latitude or longitude where the wheat was raised.

Mr. BAILEY. But this bill does not put bread on the free list.

Mr. REED. I understand that. I am not standing for this bill as a perfect measure. I think no Democrat stands for it as a perfect measure. The Senator from Texas and myself differ about the feasibility of this measure, but I want to call attention to this one fact, which seems to be constantly disturbing gentlemen on the other side. They act upon the principle that when A trades with B one or the other of those men is injured, and that when we trade with a citizen of a foreign

country we are necessarily the losers by that trade. The fact is, no two men ever trade in the world who do not each expect to gain a benefit; the fact is, that all business and all trade rests upon this great truth, that 99 per cent of the trades of the country results in mutual benefit. No American citizen would buy a Canadian product unless he gained by it, and no Canadian citizen would buy an American product unless he gained by it. If the conditions are such that interchange takes place, it follows that that is because interchange is beneficial, and it is a mere begging of the question—I will not use a harsher term—for a Senator to rise in discussing a great commercial proposition, a great trade proposition, and appeal to the prejudice that may exist against other countries.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Missouri that trade is beneficial, but my desire is to enlarge our trade in the most profitable direction. The Democratic platform of 1892 specifically denounced reciprocity with agricultural countries and recommended trade agreements with the 300,000,000 people of Europe who stand ready to take the surplus of our farm products. That was Democratic reciprocity then and now. Remembering that upon the whole Continent of Europe we hardly sell the beef product of a single ranch, I would go there for a reciprocal trade agreement. I would seek commercial arrangements, if I sought them at all, with countries which are able to pay for and which need to buy the surplus of our farms and pastures, and I would not seek an arrangement with a nation at our door which produces a surplus of the very commodities which our farmers and graziers need to sell.

Sir, I believe in good fellowship with neighbors, and I would treat our brothers on the north as well, and, as would be our duty, being older and stronger, even somewhat better than they treat us; but in commerce my closest neighbor is my best customer, and I would concede to those who buy most of what I need to sell, if I made concessions to any.

Reciprocity has a curious history. Some Democrats now call it a step in the right direction, and yet Democrats have generally refused to take that step. Every Democratic Senator voted against the provision of the McKinley bill which authorized the negotiation of trade agreements. There is in the archives of the House of Representatives—and I can mention it, as I do not refer to the present House and none of the honorable gentlemen who signed that report are now Members of that body—a minority report denouncing reciprocity of this kind prepared by one of the ablest and most consistent Democrats who ever honored that body with his services, the Hon. Henry G. Turner, of Georgia; and in our campaign book of 1902 appears a more terrific denunciation of reciprocity in general than I have ever spoken or written.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, has always called it the handmaiden of protection; but I think the author of that expression would hardly recognize the "maiden" that the Republican Party now has by the hand. The advocates of the reciprocity, which was to be a handmaiden of protection, believed, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] this afternoon declared his belief to be, that these arrangements ought to be made as to noncompeting articles.

Not only has reciprocity a curious history, but this particular example of it has met a curious reception in both the House and the Senate. This bill comes here with the earnest approval of the President, and yet the most enthusiastic friend of the administration, the most partisan Republican on this floor, will not say that it is what it ought to be. Democrats support it under a belief that it may lead to a subversion of the protective tariff system; and if I thought that it would effect that result, I would feel less hostile toward it. I do not like the philosophy which commands us to do harm in order that good may come out of it, because I believe that God so organized this universe that no good ever comes out of evil, and no evil ever comes out of good. It may be, sir, that in our blind and insufficient way it will so appear to us, and tempt us to do some small wrong in the hope that a great good will eventuate, but looking at it beyond the day or the week or the years, and down the long flight of the centuries, I am confident that we can never produce a good by doing a wrong. If, however, I could bring myself to believe that our support of this measure would divide the Republican Party and would destroy the system of protection, I would think that the American farmer could well afford to pay the price which it exacts of him.

If the Republican Party should enact this measure into a law without the aid of Democrats it would destroy that party, because whenever it confesses, either in words or by deeds, that protection can not be equally and impartially applied to all sections, to all industries, and to all classes, the country will utterly and overwhelmingly reject it. Nor do I forget that

when we declare that our doctrine of a tariff for revenue calls for exceptions in favor of some classes and exceptions against other classes the country will repudiate it.

Mr. President, the only doctrine in this world which can have the sanction of the blessed truth, the only doctrine in this world which men may safely proclaim, is a doctrine which can be equally and impartially applied at all times and in all places, to all men and to all sections, to all industries and to all classes. A doctrine that can not be so applied has in it some inherent vice.

If any Republican Senator is willing to state that this bill fairly and equally applies his doctrine, I will read an overwhelming refutation of his statement in almost every provision of it. Is there one of you willing to say that? [After a pause.] Has it come to pass, Mr. President, that a compact negotiated by a Republican President can find no single Senator of his party to say that it is a fearless and equal application of his party's doctrine?

I again challenge any one of you to say that this bill squares with your professions. There is the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], who sat by the side of the President in the Cabinet of a former administration, and yet, bound by the ties of personal friendship and of political fellowship, he will not say that this impartially and fearlessly and equally applies the Republican doctrine of protection.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], one of the stoutest defenders of the doctrine of protection, has already denounced it in more eloquent and more savage language than I can command.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and the sturdiest of them all, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], whose Republicanism has withstood the assaults of insurgency on the one side and of stalwartism on the other side, and who stands like a rock between the two, all denounce this bill. Who is there, Senators, on that side of the Chamber who will rise in his place and say that it is a fair and equal application of your doctrine. [After a pause.] And they are as silent as the grave. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator can get some of us to say that we think it is not a fair and equal distribution.

Mr. BAILEY. They all think that; but they are not candid enough, like the Senator from New Hampshire, to say so.

Mr. President, the most contemptible injustice ever proposed in the American Congress can be found in this bill. Do you know what it is? It is the provision which admits fresh vegetables, specifically naming some of them, free of duty in their natural state. If you were to peel a peach you could not bring it in without paying a tax on it, but as long as you bring it in as you plucked it from the orchard, to the rich and prosperous city folks, it will be free of all tax. If the grain from the farm, the cattle from the pasture, the fruits from the orchard, and the vegetables from the garden are to be relieved from taxation, let us not stop there. Let us provide a free list for the farmer as well as against him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator from Texas brings a thought to my mind which I want to express in just a word, and that is when the Senator is preparing his amendment I hope he will remember that hides are on the free list, and that he will place boots and shoes on the free list.

We want to show our appreciation for the kind attitude of these protectionists in the East who are now so savage in their attempt to place on the free list everything that is produced on the farm.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from South Dakota need have no fear. Shoes will join hides on the free list, and I warn these Senators who come from manufacturing States that in good time the finished product will join every other raw material on the free list. The manufacturer has no greater moral or political right to be exempted from his fair share of taxation than the millions who toil from the day's beginning to the day's end for a bare support. The manufacturers, sir, are rich and prosperous. They can better afford to pay their taxes than the working men and women of this Republic, and they may as well make up their minds to take the same measure of justice which they commend to other people. If they pay no tax on what they buy, they shall collect no tax on what they sell. If the Treasury

of this Government will permit the remission of any tax, let us remit the tax on poverty and toil. Let us remit the tax on the shoes that women and children wear rather than the tax on the hides out of which those shoes are made. Let us remit the tax on the common blanket with which the laborer must keep himself warm in the winter time. Let us repeal all of those, sir, before we enter upon the policy of remitting the taxes of the over-rich manufacturers of this land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Texas think it makes much difference at which end of the line we begin on, so we can begin and demoralize the enemy.

Mr. BAILEY. It makes a vast difference. At one end is the burden bearer, who for a century has staggered under the mighty load of this protective tariff; at the other end is the rich manufacturer, who has reaped its golden harvest; and if we must begin at only one end—I would cut both ends, share and share alike—but if we can not do this, let us begin where the relief is needed most, and subject those who have so long enjoyed these special favors to our first revision. If we can not free the product of the farm and factory, or if we can not reduce the tax on both at the same time and in the same proportion, then I shall insist upon repealing or reducing the duty on the product of the factory first.

Since a time whereof the memory of no living man runs to the contrary Democratic leaders have asserted and reasserted that our farmers have borne the burden of this protective tariff while our manufacturers have enjoyed its benefits. And shall we now stultify ourselves and impeach our good faith by proposing that the manufacturer shall continue to enjoy the profits while the farmer continues to suffer the losses of the system? I will not, sir, undertake to speak for others; but, speaking for myself, I do not hesitate to declare that I will never consent to any adjustment of tariff taxes which is calculated to augment the wealth of our manufacturers by subtracting from the wealth of our farmers. The farmer's struggle is hard enough at best, and, except the most successful of them, they have not been more than able to discharge their debts and give their children a common-school education. How different, sir, has it been with our manufacturers? They have prospered beyond the dreams of avarice. The wildest extravagance has not been able to dissipate their enormous profits and they have accumulated fortunes which the human imagination can scarcely comprehend. Mr. President, nothing could lead us further from the path of justice, which is the only path of safety, than to follow this suggestion that if we can not repeal the tax which we most desire to repeal, then we must repeal any tax which we can repeal. Such a course might culminate, and would be apt to culminate, in removing all taxes from one portion of our people while leaving onerous taxes on another portion of our people.

There are three aspects in which every tariff duty must be considered. The first is the revenue it will yield to the Public Treasury; the second is the effect upon the consumer; and the third is the effect upon the producer. No Democrat would consent to levy a tax of any kind except for the purpose of collecting money to support the Government; and while some of us think that it would be better to support the Government by a direct ad valorem tax on all property, we all know that under our Constitution, as it now stands, such a tax is not practicable and that we must collect a large sum of money each year through the customhouses. We also know that, as a general rule, the exceptions to which are rare, a tariff duty, though levied purely for the purpose of raising revenue, is a burden to the people who buy and consume the article on which it is levied and a benefit to those who produce and sell that article, and no wise man or just man can ignore that consequence. It is therefore the manifest duty of a Democrat when he comes to levy tariff taxes to adjust them so that the burdens and the benefits will be distributed as equally as possible. We must do that, not because we believe in protecting anybody, but because we believe, first, that the burden of taxation shall rest in fair proportion upon all people; and, second, that an unavoidable incident of taxation shall extend to all classes as nearly as possible without discrimination. This simple rule of justice, sir, is sometimes stigmatized by men who do not think to the bottom of this question, as a plea for protection; but it is far from that, and it is neither more nor less than the assertion of that ancient and fundamental Democratic principle that all men shall have equal rights and that no man shall have a special privilege.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to interrupt the Senator from Texas with a question or two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BAILEY. I will.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator speaks of the heavy burdens which have been laid upon the farmers for the benefit of the manufacturers. Is he not aware of the fact that the great strength of the Republican Party in the past years has been due to the fact that it has been able to hoodwink the farmers, of the West particularly, into the belief that they were getting a benefit from this protective system?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true, and I regret it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, if that be true, I ask the Senator these two questions: If the result of this reciprocity bill, when passed, shall be to take from the farmer some measure of protection, as the Senator from Texas evidently believes, but which I do not believe, then will not the effect be that the farmers' eyes will be opened, and he will then come to the aid of the Senator from Texas in helping to remove this burden from the country? And if, on the other hand, the farmer of the West finds that he has been receiving a gold brick and that he suffers no loss from the removal of this nominal protection, will he not be ready then to vote his own convictions without the corrupting influence of the idea that he has been deriving some benefit out of this tariff?

Mr. BAILEY. In reply to the Senator's first question I will say that if the farmer can be made to understand that the Republican Party desires to repeal the duty on his products, and does not intend to repeal the duty on the manufactured commodities which he must buy, then, undoubtedly, he will take his revenge on that party, but if we help to inflict this injustice we will lose the benefit of the farmer's resentment against the Republican Party. I can not bring myself to believe that we can make people love us by punishing them, and yet that must be true if we can convert the farmers of the United States to the Democratic Party by levying a tax on what they buy and taking it off of what they sell.

The second question of the Senator from Nebraska assumes that the duties on agricultural products do not affect their price. That is true as to some of those products, but it is not true as to others. Our farmers understand that as well as the Senator from Nebraska or myself, but they also understand that a duty which does not increase the price at which they sell does not increase the price at which the city people buy. In an audience of 500 farmers it might be possible for you to convince 100 of them that, due to causes which are not always plain, but which the most thoughtful men can comprehend, the duty on some agricultural products will not benefit the farmer. But if you convince 100 of that audience of that, the other 400 will go about their several ways shaking their heads and rejecting an argument which tells them that a duty enhances the price of what they buy and does not enhance the price of what they sell.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi first, and then to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Texas permit a question? Following up the second part of the question of the Senator from Nebraska, understanding that the Senator from Texas agrees with the Senator from Nebraska that these duties have been put there to hoodwink the farmer and that they have hoodwinked him, could we not perhaps get his love by unhoodwinking him, undeceiving him? Suppose, after we pass this bill, because of the infinitesimal amount of wheat produced in Canada, the price of wheat does not fall.

Mr. BAILEY. Then they will say that our whole argument on the tariff question is unsound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon. We have never contended that where we exported a large surplus of a product protection could raise the price. So the farmers could not say that, but they would say to the Republicans, "For years you have deceived us with a siren song that this protection on wheat added to our profit. We have discovered that it does not. Now we do not believe any of the fish story at all."

Mr. BAILEY. That is presuming too much on the farmer's ignorance.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BAILEY. Just a moment, and then I will. For the first time in a hundred years we have reached the point where a duty, whether for protection or revenue, does affect the price of wheat. When the surplus is the larger part of a crop, as it is of the cotton crop, it is absolutely certain that no duty can enhance the price of the part of the crop consumed in this country. But the price can be enhanced by a tariff duty, notwithstanding a surplus, and I call in witness of that fact the

repeated denunciation of Democratic Senators and Representatives against the American manufacturers who have sold their surplus products in the markets of the world cheaper than they have sold them here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if the Senator from Texas will permit, there is this difference, and it is an immense one. A manufacturing industry may overproduce what is needed for the home market and send products abroad year after year and hold up the home market for the price equal to the tariff privilege. But it is because, from the very nature of the business, the manufacturers can combine and form trusts and control prices, protected behind the tariff wall, and the farmer, from the very nature of his business, has never done that in the world and can never do it.

Now, then, just one word more. It is not the quantity of surplus that makes a product a world product, but it is the fact that the man has produced more than he can sell in the home market, and whenever that is the case the supply has outrun the demand in the home market and he must seek an outlet for the surplus abroad. But the moment he has to seek it, that moment he seeks the world's price and not the home price, unless the natural operation of things can be interrupted by the formation of trusts.

The Republican Party taught for years that if you put a tariff upon products until you had encouraged home industry to equal the demand, then finally competition in the home market would bring things down to a price below that at which you could have bought in the world's market. That would have happened in the course of time wherever the protective duty had worked to establish and render profitable an industry to such an extent that that industry, operating in America, could produce cheaper than abroad, as can be done now in the steel business. It would have operated that way but for the fact that these large industrial enterprises of a manufacturing character are necessarily in a few hands, the few heads attached to which can hatch combinations to maintain the price in the home to the level of the foreign price plus that of the tariff, whereas the farmers' business is in the hands of forty-odd million people, and it is absolutely impossible for them to combine. In the natural order of things, after building up, housing, artificially, by law, at the expense of the people for a long time an industry of some description, the result was that after a while, if it succeeded at all, it might succeed to the point where it could outproduce the foreigner, in the sense of producing either a better article at the same price or a cheaper article of the same quality and without combination the price would have fallen.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in a part of what he has just said, the Senator from Mississippi furnishes an additional argument in support of my contention. He says that the farmers can not combine, and do not combine; and I say that therefore it must be less burdensome to others for us to leave a duty on what they produce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. BAILEY. He says that the manufacturers can combine, and do combine; and I say that, therefore, they ought to be the first people exposed to the competition of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In that I heartily concur. I wish to God we could begin at the other end of the line.

Mr. BAILEY. The fallacy of the theory that the price of wheat in this country is determined by its price in the markets of the world is easily exposed. There is not a Senator on this floor, including the Senator from Mississippi, who does not know that if our wheat crop this year should fall below 500,000,000 bushels the Chicago price would rise above the Liverpool price, the cost of transportation considered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You mean by that simply this: That if the production of wheat reached a point where we would have to import wheat, the price at the point of consumption would be larger than at the point whence it was exported. Nobody will dispute that. If you mean a case where the quantity of American consumption falls so that we would have to import wheat, then I would not deny the proposition. But as long as there was a surplus of home production over home consumption, I do deny your proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator ought to know that a 500,000,000-bushel crop would not bring us under the necessity of importing wheat. It would undoubtedly place us under the necessity of enlarging our use of corn for breadstuff, but no wheat would be imported unless we take the duty off Canadian wheat, and then we would import that instead of supplementing a short wheat crop with corn. If the Senator from Mississippi will read the report of Israel T. Hatch, made to a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, he will find it stated there that when they passed the Canadian treaty of 1854 it was believed that

the price of wheat was regulated in the markets of the world, but that our experience for six years under that treaty exploded that theory. Hatch was a Treasury expert.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But does the Senator from Texas agree that that opinion by an expert was correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi must address the Chair and get the consent of the Senator on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg pardon.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator believe that that opinion is a correct opinion?

Mr. BAILEY. In my judgment, that opinion was justified by the course of wheat prices which he then had before him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At a time when we were raising twice as much wheat as we could consume, as was the case then, I would deny the proposition. We are now at a point where we export very largely the crop.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Mississippi is mistaken in his estimate of our wheat exports.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not mean mathematically twice as large, but I mean a great deal more.

Mr. BAILEY. We exported less than 18 per cent of our wheat crop last year; and, as a matter of fact, it may happen, and it will happen in any short-crop year, that the price of wheat in this country will be above the Liverpool price, the cost of transportation considered. If the price is fixed at Liverpool, how could the price here be above the price there?

Generally it is true that the price of the surplus will fix the price of the crop, and that is as true of factory products as it is of farm products. But that is subject to a number of limitations, and it grows diminishingly less true as consumption meets production. That is exactly what has happened now. If the Senator from Mississippi and others had joined me, I would now be charging that the Republican Party has maintained a duty on agricultural products when they were of no special benefit to the farmer; but that just as soon as we had reached a point where the farmer will derive some benefit from those duties it proposes to repeal them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with the forcible argument which the Senator is now making in regard to wheat, I want to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Mississippi and others, who are taking the opposite view, seem to assume that all that is raised upon the farms of the Northwest is wheat, which is exported.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just happened to use that as an illustration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a matter of fact, we raise barley by the million bushels, and we do not export it. We raise flax by the million bushels, and we do not export it. We raise broom corn; we raise vegetables; we raise rye; we raise oats; and we raise numerous articles of which we have no surplus to export. It is not fair to assume that the only subject of discussion in connection with the products of the northwestern farms is wheat. While the argument in regard to wheat has been destroyed by the Senator from Texas and others, it is not the only product that is affected by this trade agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not like to be left in an attitude where it might seem I was disingenuous in an argument. I happened to use wheat as an illustration because the Senator from Texas was talking about it. I freely admit that upon all products which are not exported, but which are imported, the removal of the tariff, in the absence of other controlling causes, will or ought to reduce the price. Then, I take the Democratic position that where untaxing a product is removing the tariff tax from a product reduces the price to the consumer it merely gives to the consumer an advantage that God gave him and which he ought to have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the Senator from Mississippi is drifting into this position. He justifies the removal of the tariff from rye and justifies leaving a tariff of \$2.25 a gallon on whisky. He justifies taking the tariff off barley and keeping a tariff of 25 cents a gallon on beer and a tariff of 45 cents a hundred on malt. For the benefit of whom? The consumer of beer and whisky? No; for the benefit of the Brewers' Trust and the Distillers' Trust.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not responsible for the curious inferences that may be drawn by the Senator. I am responsible only for what I have said. His inferences are his own; and, like the scriptural definition of man, they are "fearfully and wonderfully made." I stick to what I said, and I decline to have put into my mouth what was said by the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, although I did not, when I took the floor, expect to occupy a fraction of the time which I have consumed, I believe I will trespass upon the patience of the Senate a little further while I point out to Democratic Senators who think this trade agreement is "a step in the right direction," that as to many of its principal items it affords the manufacturer a higher protection than the existing law. When it was reported to the Senate I made that statement and asserted that by a simple process of addition and subtraction I could sustain it. I will now undertake to do so. First, let us take cattle. The present duty on cattle worth more than \$14 per head is 27½ per cent, and therefore the duty on a Canadian steer worth \$40 would be \$11. The present duty on the meat which that steer will dress is 1½ cents per pound, and, assuming that the steer will dress 800 pounds—certainly he will not dress more than that—the protection to the packer is \$12. Thus, under the existing law, the packer pays \$11 for the privilege of importing a steer and enjoys a protection of \$12 on the dressed meat, giving him a net protection of only \$1. Under this treaty the \$11 now paid by the packer is entirely remitted, but the duty on the dressed meat is only reduced from 1½ cents per pound to 1¼ cents per pound, or from \$12 on the whole carcass under the existing law to \$10 under this treaty. So, Mr. President, while under the existing law the packer pays \$11 to import a steer and has \$12 protection on the meat, under this treaty he pays nothing to import the steer and has \$10 protection on the meat, making a net gain of \$9 to the packer, with a net loss of \$11 to the Government. Is there any fault with that arithmetic? It is a simple calculation.

Will this bill reduce the price of beef? It reduces the duty on it a quarter of a cent per pound. Is anybody simple-minded enough to believe that this quarter of a cent will ever reach the beef-eaters of the United States? Oh, no; beef is not sold to the consumer in fractional parts of a cent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. Let me illustrate this same iniquity with wheat.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator leaves that point—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas prefers not to yield now.

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If this is a mathematical proposition, of course it ought to be based on facts which exist. I understand that no beef cattle of that grade are imported from Canada for packing.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I notice in the report of the total imports from Canada, beef cattle of the grade the Senator mentions do not exceed the receipts of five days at the South Omaha stockyards. So it is practically negligible.

Mr. BAILEY. However many or however few are imported, the fact remains that they are imported; and the tariff duty prevents the importation of a large number.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think not for packing.

Mr. BAILEY. The attorney of the Cattle Raisers' Association stated before our committee that Chicago buyers were in Canada at that time to buy cattle.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has demonstrated very clearly if they have not imported cattle from there, there will be every opportunity to do so if this change is made.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Texas allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I want to direct his attention to the Province of Alberta, which can be seen on that map yonder. It is about the size of the State of Texas, and it is every bit as good a cattle country. A number of Americans drive their cattle and sheep up there to feed and fatten them and get them in a good condition. They can raise as many cattle in the Province of Alberta as they can raise in the State of Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. One of the largest ranches in the State of Texas sends cattle from our State to Canada for the purpose of maturing them, and the manager of that ranch is, or at least has been, president of the American Live Stock Association.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me one word further?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] can tell him how he has taken sheep up into that country and fed and fattened them.

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator that men who are interested with me have taken many and many a head of cattle up into Canada to fatten. You can take yearlings from this country to Canada and they will mature into beef cattle, I think, at least 12 months before they can possibly mature in this country.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. The strongest feed I know of anywhere is Canadian buffalo grass.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator from Utah if he thinks that sending his sheep or cattle up into Canada to fatten was injurious to the people of the United States, and if so why so patriotic a gentleman would have permitted them to graze on the grasses of Canada and injure the people of the United States by bringing them back to sell them.

Mr. SMOOT. If the American people have to buy cattle from some other country it would be an entirely different proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. President, assuming that the tariff, as I say it does, increases the price of the domestic article to the extent of the tariff, and thus keeps out the imported article, that would explain the small importation. But what will you say when the packer is permitted to pay \$11 less for all the American steers which he buys?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The answer to that might be taken from the mouths of some of the Senators on the Republican side who have announced—

Mr. BAILEY. I would not accept their answer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Who have announced that if this tariff wall is taken down it will confer a great benefit upon the Canadian producers, who will be able to derive American prices.

Mr. BAILEY. But I do not say that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is what they have said.

Mr. BAILEY. But you can not make me responsible for what even the most excellent of them say. I said the result would be that their price would rise and our price would fall until an equilibrium would be established; and I am willing to record that statement here, and the years to come will verify it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Texas, as he was making this comparison in mathematics, claimed that the duty would be \$11 on the steer on foot, and then \$12 practically for the dressed beef. Does he mean to argue that the remittal of \$11, entailing a consequent drop in the price of American cattle, would have no effect upon the price of beef to those who buy beef? I know there would be less revenue to the Government if we imported any considerable amount, and there might be a loss to the cattle raiser; but would the remittal of \$11 on the Canadian importation and the loss of \$11 to the American producer have no effect on the price to the consumer, notwithstanding the duty of 1¼ cents a pound on the dressed beef?

Mr. BAILEY. Absolutely none, Mr. President. If the people consumed cattle, then to remit the \$11 on cattle would reduce the price; but the people eat beef, and the reduction on dressed beef is only one-quarter of a cent, which is not susceptible of a division that can be transmitted to the consumer.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I can not see exactly how the American people can eat beef which had not been cattle.

Mr. BAILEY. Cattle are the raw material, beef is the finished product, and the Senator knows that a tax on the raw material does not affect the price of the finished product; but only affects the cost of producing it. The cost of cattle affects the cost of producing beef just as the cost of wool affects the cost of producing woolen goods, but you could give the woolen manufacturer his wool, not only free of tax, but free of all cost, and if you left him a duty of 50 per cent on his woolen goods he would charge just as much for them as he would if he paid 50 per cent on his wool. The Senator agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do; but that comes back to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi, where he claims that on account of the smaller number of those engaged in that kind of business it goes beyond and transcends any protection at all and simply becomes a question of capital and of power to combine.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, Mr. President, if the Democratic Party obtains control of this Government, we shall settle the trust question in the criminal courts, and not at the customhouses. Taxation is not a proper means of punishing crimes. When the shoe manufacturers petitioned us to put hides on the free list they said it would help to break up the trust. We put hides on the free list, and in 90 days the Leather Trust enlarged its operations and increased the price of its products. No; the customhouse is not the place to break up the trusts; the criminal court is the proper place for that work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Texas will permit me, ought we not to break up the trusts in two ways—first, by not tempting them to commit the crime, which the tariff does; and, second, by punishing them if they do commit the crime?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Mississippi and myself perfectly agree that they ought never to be tempted to commit the crime by a tariff levied for protection; but as the Senator from Mississippi and myself must levy a tariff for the purpose of raising revenue to support the Government, he and I contend that the wool manufacturer when he imports his wool ought to be compelled to pay taxes for the support of the Government the same as our fellow-citizens do when they import their woolen goods. I assume that the Senator from South Carolina agrees with that also.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been wondering, Mr. President, where the temptation comes to the manufacturer in Great Britain, a free-trade country, where they have just as many trusts as we have in our Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. Not as many, but they have them there. None of us have ever doubted that there are certain commodities which can be subjected to trusts and combinations, irrespective of the tariff. But the Senator does not doubt that if trusts can be organized under a system of free trade, they can be organized more easily under a protective tariff.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, Mr. President, there is this difference, too, if the Senator from Texas will permit me—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A trust can not succeed in Great Britain except in one way, and that is either by producing cheaper, so that it can sell cheaper to the consumer, or by obtaining such a reputation for the quality of its goods that it virtually monopolizes the market, or very nearly so. It is not aided by the law in doing either. Nobody objects to anybody getting as large a business as he can, provided he does it by either bettering the quality or lowering the price of the article he is producing.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is interesting to see the zeal and avidity with which certain Democratic Senators always come to the rescue of a foreign Government as against ours. I think the Senator from Mississippi is drawing on his imagination when he pictures the trusts of Great Britain as being beneficent institutions.

Mr. BAILEY. Democratic Senators do not come to the rescue of foreign governments; but they endeavor always to come to the rescue of the American consumer.

Now, let me make another illustration. This time with wheat. The present duty on wheat is 25 cents a bushel, and it requires practically $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat to grind into a barrel of flour. Therefore, under the existing law, the miller pays to the Government of the United States \$1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ for importing enough wheat to grind into a barrel of flour. Under the existing law the duty on flour is 25 per cent, and the average price of flour imported from Canada is \$5 a barrel. The average of last year, as I now recall, was four dollars and eighty odd cents, but for the sake of the round numbers we will say \$5 a barrel. It is sometimes a little more than that and sometimes a little less. At \$5 a barrel, 25 per cent would give a protection of \$1.25 a barrel. Thus the miller pays to the Government \$1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ when he imports

the wheat out of which he makes a barrel of flour, and has a protection of \$1.25 against the Canadian miller's competition. The net protection to him on his flour above what he pays on his wheat is 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per barrel.

This reciprocity treaty completely repeals the duty on wheat and saves to the American miller the \$1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ which he pays under the existing law to the Government for the privilege of importing $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat; but it still leaves a duty of 50 cents per barrel on flour. Now, make your addition and subtraction. His net protection under the existing law is 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per barrel. His net protection under this treaty is 50 cents a barrel. Thus this measure multiplies the miller's protection by four. Will any Senator controvert those simple figures? Will any Senator deny that calculation?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I wish to call his attention to the fact—

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. That in addition to the duty of 50 cents a barrel on flour there is a duty of 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a hundred on the bran and shorts, which is equal to \$2.50 a ton.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. NELSON. And the statistics reported by the Tariff Commission show that there is a difference on bran, shorts, and millfeed of from \$2.50 to \$3 a ton, and the farmer can not even get the benefit of that under this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. Now, Mr. President, will any fair-minded man contend that it is just and fair to make the American farmer sell his wheat to the miller free of tax, and then compel him to pay a tax on it when he buys it back in the shape of flour. Not only, sir, does this treaty force the farmer to sell free wheat and buy taxed flour made of his free wheat, but it does not even allow him to purchase the by-products of his wheat on the same terms and conditions as he sold it. Is this just? Is this fair? Is this honest? The farmer bestows more labor upon producing wheat than the miller does in grinding it.

The farmer plows the ground; he sows his wheat; he watches it through flood and drought until harvest time, and reaps it. He thrashes it, then takes it to the mill and sells it. Through long and anxious months he watches over his crop and tends it, and yet he shall have no tax upon the product of his land and of his labor, but the miller who converts it by machinery into flour in less time than it took the farmer to haul it from his granary to the mill shall have his 50 cents on every barrel for the process. When, sir, did machinery and inventive genius derive a higher right to the consideration of the American Government than the man of flesh and blood made in the image of his God?

Mr. President, these inequalities and these injustices run through all this bill, but as the hour is such that I can not point them all out this afternoon, I will address myself to this subject again at some more convenient time.

Mr. President, I have already detained the Senate this afternoon longer than I expected to do. The Senate, of course, will bear with me or has borne with me patiently, because I have cheerfully submitted to a number of interruptions. I believe that I will now yield the floor, and at some convenient time—not to-morrow, because I have another matter concerning my duties here which will require my attention then—but at some convenient time I will resume and conclude what I desire to say on this subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 20, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, June 19, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee that in the dispensation of Thy providence Thou didst set apart one day in the seven for rest, reflection, and worship; that a large majority of our people appreciate its worth and feel the uplift of that spirit which makes for righteousness in the soul, in the home, in the State, or Nation through its observance. Grant that it may more and more obtain in the hearts of our people. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 17, 1911, was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6733) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve objection to the consideration of the bill in order to have some explanation made of it.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the bill be read. Is there objection to that?

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. I do not ask that the bill be read, if the gentleman from Arkansas objects.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas objects. That strikes the bill from the calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the consideration of the bill H. R. 767, the pension bill on the Calendar for Motions to Discharge Committees.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, as a quorum is not present.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 130, noes 78.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. It has been demonstrated there is a quorum present.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 115, answered "present" 11, not voting 107, as follows:

YEAS—154.

Adair	Dickson, Miss.	Helm	Richardson
Alexander	Dies	Henry, Tex.	Robinson
Allen	Difenderfer	Hensley	Roddenbery
Ansberry	Dixon, Ind.	Holland	Rothermel
Ashbrook	Donohoe	Houston	Rouse
Ayres	Doremus	Howard	Rube
Barnhart	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Russell
Bathrick	Dupre	Hughes, N. J.	Sabath
Bell, Tex.	Ellerbe	Hull	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Humphreys, Miss.	Shackleford
Blackmon	Evans	Jacoway	Sheppard
Booher	Faison	Johnson, Ky.	Sims
Borland	Fields	Johnson, S. C.	Sisson
Brantley	Finley	Korbly	Slayden
Buchanan	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Small
Bulkeley	Flood, Pa.	Lee, Pa.	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	Floyd, Ark.	Lever	Stanley
Burleson	Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Stedman
Burnett	Francis	Littlepage	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallagher	Littleton	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garner	Lloyd	Sulzer
Callaway	Garrett	McCoy	Talbot, Md.
Candler	George	McGillcuddy	Talcott, N. Y.
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Macon	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Goeke	Maguire, Nebr.	Thayer
Clayton	Goldfogle	Maher	Thomas
Cline	Goodwin, Ark.	Mays	Townsend
Collier	Graham	Morrison	Tribble
Connell	Gray	Moss, Ind.	Turnbull
Covington	Gregg, Pa.	Oldfield	Tuttle
Cox, Ind.	Gregg, Tex.	O'Shaunessy	Underwood
Cullop	Gudger	Padgett	Webb
Curley	Hamlin	Page	Witherspoon
Daugherty	Hardwick	Pou	Wickliffe
Davenport	Hardy	Ralney	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, W. Va.	Harrison, Miss.	Raker	Young, Tex.
Dent	Harrison, N. Y.	Randell, Tex.	
Denver	Hay	Ransdell, La.	
Dickinson	Hedlin	Reilly	

NAYS—115.

Akin, N. Y.	Claypool	Draper	Gardner, Mass.
Anderson, Minn.	Cooper	Driscoll, M. E.	Gardner, N. J.
Anderson, Ohio	Copley	Dwight	Good
Anthony	Crago	Dyer	Guernsey
Austin	Currier	Esch	Hamilton, W. Va.
Bartholdt	Dalzell	Focht	Harris
Burke, S. Dak.	Danforth	Fordney	Helgesen
Calder	Davidson	Foss	Higgins
Campbell	Davis, Minn.	Foster, Vt.	Howell
Cannon	De Forest	Fowler	Howland
Catlin	Dodds	French	Hubbard

Humphrey, Wash.	McKenzie	Post	Sulloway
Jackson	McKinley	Powers	Switzer
Kahn	McKinney	Pray	Taylor, Ohio
Kendall	Madison	Prouty	Thistlewood
Kennedy	Malby	Rees	Towner
Kent	Mann	Rodenberg	Utter
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Martin, Colo.	Rucker, Colo.	Volstead
Konop	Matthews	Sells	Vreeland
Kopp	Miller	Sharp	Wedemeyer
La Follette	Mondell	Simmons	White
Langley	Morse, Wis.	Slomp	Wilder
Lawrence	Murdock	Sloan	Willis
Lenroot	Needham	Smith, J. M. C.	Willson, Ill.
Lobeck	Norris	Smith, Saml. W.	Wood, N. J.
Longworth	Olmsted	Speer	Woods, Iowa
Loud	Payne	Steenerson	Young, Kans.
McCall	Pickett	Stephens, Cal.	Young, Mich.
McGuire, Okla.	Plumley	Stone	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Adamson	Fairchild	Langham	Morgan
Bartlett	Fuller	McLaughlin	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	James	McMorran	

NOT VOTING—107.

Aiken, S. C.	Gordon	Lee, Ga.	Porter
Ames	Gould	Legare	Prince
Andrus	Greene	Levy	Pujo
Barchfield	Griest	Lindbergh	Rauch
Bates	Hamill	Lindsay	Redfield
Berger	Hamilton, Mich.	Linthicum	Reyburn
Bingham	Hammond	Loudenslager	Riordan
Boehne	Hanna	McCreary	Roberts, Mass.
Bowman	Hartman	McDermott	Roberts, Nev.
Bradley	Haugen	McHenry	Rucker, Mo.
Broussard	Hawley	Madden	Scully
Brown	Hayes	Martin, S. Dak.	Sherley
Burke, Pa.	Heald	Mitchell	Sherwood
Butler	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hill	Moon, Tenn.	Sparkman
Cary	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Stack
Conry	Hobson	Moore, Tex.	Sterling
Cox, Ohio	Jones	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Cravens	Kindred	Murray	Sweet
Crumpacker	Kinhead, N. J.	Nelson	Taylor, Ala.
Driscoll, D. A.	Kipp	Nye	Tilson
Edwards	Kitchin	Palmer	Underhill
Farr	Knowland	Parran	Warburton
Ferris	Konig	Patten, N. Y.	Weeks
Fornes	Lafean	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Gillett	Lafferty	Pepper	Wilson, N. Y.
Glass	Latta	Peters	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
 Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. GREENE.
 Mr. McHENRY with Mr. HAWLEY.
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. STERLING.
 Mr. PEPPER with Mr. HEALD.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. BATES.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. PRINCE.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MITCHELL.
 Mr. LEVY with Mr. McCREARY.
 Mr. KINHEAD of New Jersey with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. AMES.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. HILL.
 Mr. REDFIELD with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.
 Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. CRUMPACKER.
 Mr. WHITACRE with Mr. BOWMAN.
 Mr. KONIG with Mr. WARBURTON.
 Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. STACK with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. RAUCH with Mr. HANNA.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. GILLETT.
 Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. REYBURN.
 Mr. BROWN with Mr. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. LAFFERTY.
 Mr. WATKINS with Mr. LINDBERGH.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. NYE.
 Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. FULLER.
 Mr. McDERMOTT with Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. HINDS.
 Mr. SWEET with Mr. WEEKS.
 Mr. JAMES with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. MOORE of Texas with Mr. HAYES (transferable).
 Mr. KINDRED with Mr. LAFEAN.
 Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD (transferable).
 Mr. KITCHEN with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. MURRAY with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. KIPP with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CRAVEN with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. HAUGEN.

From May 12 until further notice:

Mr. GORDON with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

From May 24 until further notice:

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.

From June 6 until further notice:

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. MORGAN.

For 10 days:

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. HARTMAN.

For the vote:

Mr. BOEHNE (against) with Mr. EDWARDS (in favor).

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. FORTNE with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. McMORRAN (transferable).

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HAMILTON, has voted?

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. JAMES. Then I desire to withdraw my vote in the affirmative and vote "present." I have a general pair with him.

The name of the gentleman from Kentucky was called, and he voted "Present."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire if the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. NYE, voted?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I wish to withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

The name of the gentleman from Florida was called, and he voted "Present."

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. HOBSON, vote?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Then I would like to withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The name of the gentleman from New York, Mr. FAIRCHILD, was called, and he voted "Present."

Mr. WATKINS. How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name was called?

Mr. WATKINS. No, sir; I did not quite get in in time. I thought it was a call of the House. I wanted to vote "present."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the announcement of the vote—

Mr. HAY, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days on account of death in his family.

Mr. HAMMOND, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for 10 days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 12.45 p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 20, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of Absecon Creek, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of Mulberry and Locust Forks of the Warrior River up to Mulberry Fork to Saunders Ferry, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with accompanying illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 11849) providing for the erection of a memorial at Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 11850) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare designs and estimates for and report cost of a national archives building in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11851) to authorize the extension of East Capitol Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11852) to authorize the Providence, Warren & Bristol Railroad Co. and its lessee, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Palmyers or Warren River, in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11853) to establish a mining experiment station at Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11854) providing for the disposition of the tax on cotton collected during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1863, to June 30, 1868; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 11855) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 11876) creating a national road commission and prescribing its powers and duties; also creating a system of national roads, establishing a national road fund, and providing the manner of expending the same in cooperation with the several States for the furtherance of good roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 11856) for the relief of Mary A. Shufeldt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11857) granting a pension to James P. McLain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11858) granting a pension to Mary E. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 11859) granting a pension to C. H. Saint Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 11860) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 11861) for the relief of Joseph G. McNutt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11862) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11863) granting an increase of pension to William Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 11865) for the relief of William M. Dougal, trustee of the estate of William H. Dougal, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11866) for the relief of William M. Dougal, trustee of the estate of Morris Adler, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 11867) granting an increase of pension to John Pattison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11868) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 11869) granting a pension to George M. Tye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11870) granting an increase of pension to Stephen House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11871) granting an increase of pension to Israel Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11872) granting an increase of pension to Faris Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11873) granting an increase of pension to John Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 11874) for the relief of Joseph Murray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 11875) granting a pension to Arthur T. Whipple; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: Resolution of Group 6, New York State Bankers' Association, favoring the Aldrich proposal for currency reform; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petitions of numerous citizens of New York City, favoring the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, in favor of the establishment of a court of patent appeals; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, relating to the manner of revising the tariff laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Galesville and Ettrick, Wis., favoring reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: Petitions of numerous citizens favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petitions of various citizens of Pearl, Tex., asking for a reduction of the duty on raw sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of Newark, N. J., favoring an amendment to the corporation-tax law, so as to permit corporations to make their returns as of the fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers in support of bill to grant an increase of pension to John Pattison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of private pension bill for Winfield S. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Herman Poseman, of Providence, R. I., asking for the adoption of House bill 161, authorizing the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to investigate the immigration office at the port of New York and other places; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition from John C. Rankin, of Rankin, Ky., and other citizens of Rankin and Monticello, Ky., requesting a reduction on the duty of raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Group 6, New York State Bankers' Association, approving the Aldrich proposal for currency reform; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Wilhelm Straube, asking for the adoption of House resolution No. 166, introduced by Mr. SULZER, authorizing an investigation of the office of immigrant commissioner at the port of New York and other places; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance, of Hartford, Conn., demanding the removal of Commissioner W. Williams, and for a more liberal administration of affairs at Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance, of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the administration of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 20, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PRESENTATION OF SILVER SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following communication, which will be read.

The Secretary read the communication, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1911.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The beautiful silver tea service which the Members of the Senate have so kindly sent us in remembrance of our twenty-fifth anniversary has just arrived, and I hasten to express to you, and through you, to the Senators, our deep appreciation of their courtesy.

In conveying our sincere thanks will you kindly add that we shall always value the exquisite gift more especially as a souvenir of the kindness and courtesy of the distinguished body of men from whom it comes.

In sending our cordial thanks, believe me, with kindest regards from the President and myself.

Very sincerely, yours,

HELEN H. TAFT.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Lowell, Mass., praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Keuka Park, N. Y., and a petition of the Business Men's Association of New London, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Brickmakers' Local Union No. 16, of Belleville, Ill.; of the county board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Essex County, Mass.; and of Local Division No. 5, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of New Brunswick, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CUMMINS presented memorials of sundry farmers of Decatur, Lake City, and Martinsburg, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of Local Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Mankato, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Newark, N. J., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Haddonfield Grange, No. 33; Wayne Township Grange, No. 145; and Pemberton Grange, No. 50, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burlington County, N. J., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Stanley Congregational Church, of Chatham, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Simon Blake, of Jersey City, N. J., and a memorial of Local Division No. 16, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Jersey City, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented memorials of East Worcester Grange, No. 1238; Gouverneur Grange, No. 303; Enfield Valley Grange, No. 295; Elma Grange, No. 1179; Easton Grange, No. 1123; Lenox Grange, No. 1373; Veteran Grange, No. 1108; Constable Grange, No. 1047; and Watertown Grange, No. 7, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DU PONT presented a memorial of the Third Ward Democratic Club, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BOURNE presented a memorial of Sinslaw Grange, No. 54, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lorane, Oreg., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR FOURTH CIRCUIT.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 2604) authorizing the President to appoint an additional circuit judge for the fourth circuit, reported it without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 2823) for the relief of Charles R. Crosby (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2824) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Crabbs (with accompanying paper); and